DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 375 **VT 012 855**

TITLE	Conference on Upgrading and New Careers.
INSTITUTION	National Manpower Policy Task Force, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	20 Mar 70
NOTE	133p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Manpower Policy Task Force, 1819 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Career Ladders, Career Opportunities, Conference Reports, *Culturally Disadvantaged, *Employment Programs, Federal Aid, *Job Development, Manpower Development, *Manpower Utilization, *Occupational Mobility, Promotion (Occupational)

ABSTRACT

This conference met to consider the political and financial problems in providing government-financed programs to improve upgrading in private and public jobs. The morning session was devoted to federal support of upgrading in industry. In the afternoon session, participants discussed new careers in the service sector, including civil service employment. The eight papers were presented by Seymour Brandwein, Samuel Marks, Dennis Derryck, Eleanor Gilpatrick, Jean Couturier, Sumner Rosen, Arnold Nemore, and Sidney Fine. (BH)

ED049375

CONFERENCE
ON
UPGRADING AND NEW CAREERS

SPONSORED BY

THE

NATIONAL MANPOWER POLICY TASK FORCE

MARCH 20, 1970

818 18TH STREET, N. W.
SUITE 240
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

PRICE – $5.00

VT012855

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Conference
on
Upgrading and New Careers

Sponsored by

the

National Manpower Policy Task Force

March 20, 1970

818 18th Street, N.W.
Suite 240
Washington, D. C., 20006

NATIONAL MANPOWER POLICY TASK FORCE

Curtis Aller
San Francisco State College

E. Wight Bakke
Yale University

Lisle Carter
Cornell University

Rashi Fein
Harvard University

Eli Ginzberg
Columbia University

Frederick H. Harbison
Princeton University

Vivian Henderson
Clark College

Myron Joseph
Carnegie-Mellon University

Charles C. Killingsworth
Michigan State University

Sar A. Levitan, Vice-Chairman
The George Washington University

Garth L. Mangum
University of Utah

F. Ray Marshall
University of Texas

Charles A. Myers, Chairman
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Albert Rees
Princeton University

R. Thayne Robson
University of Utah

Gerald G. Somers
University of Wisconsin

M. H. Trytten
National Academy of Sciences

Lloyd Ulman
University of California, Berkeley

Lowell M. Glenn
Executive Director

This Conference was prepared under a contract with the Office of Research and Development, Manpower Administration, United States Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Researchers undertaking such projects with Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

Table of Contents

Keynote Speaker

Page
Introduction - Charles A. Myers.............. 1

New Careers and Upgrading Legislative Strategies - Hon. James H. Scheuer........... 2

Discussion................................ 5

Morning Session

Federally Supported Upgrading in Industry
F. Ray Marshall - Chairman

The Search for New Ways and Means - Seymour Brandwein.......................... 12

Upgrading Issues and Policies for the Seventies Samuel B. Marks............................ 21

Breakthrough in the Building Trades - Dennis A. Derryck.......................... 29

Technical Support for Building Job and Educational Ladders - Eleanor Gilpatrick... 38

Discussion 50

Luncheon Address

Russell A. Nixon............................ 62

Afternoon Session

New Careers and the Service Sector
Gerald G. Somers - Chairman

Upgrading: A Framework for Careers - Michael D. Batton & Sidney D. Fine......... 74

Accommodating Merit Systems to Upgrading - Jean Couturier............................ 84

Page

Upgrading and New Careers in Health - Sumner M. Rosen.......................... 92

Lessons from Technical Assistance - Arnold Nemore.............................. 104

Discussion................................ 112

Summary Session

Eli Cohen................................ 119
Sar A. Levitan............................ 122
S. M. Miller............................. 124
Charles A. Myers.......................... 125

APPENDIX

List of Participants

INTRODUCTION

CHARLES A. MYERS
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Chairman, National Manpower Policy Task Force

CHARLES A. MYERS: As you know, this is a conference sponsored by the National Manpower Policy Task Force. We have been engaged in various activities, the latest of which is a policy statement issued in January of this year, Improving the Nation's Manpower Efforts, which reviews the three manpower bills before the Congress.

Since there are four speakers in each of our two sessions beginning at 10:00 and again at 2:00, we would appreciate a brief fifteen minute summary of the main points of each presentation rather than reading the whole paper. Finally, I would like to express our gratitude to those who agreed to volunteer their time in the preparation of the formal presentations today.

We begin this morning with the Honorable James H. Scheuer, known to most of you as not only a distinguished Congressman from New York but the author of the Scheuer amendment of the Economic Opportunity Act which initiated the New Careers Program. We are all honored to have Congressman Scheuer with us to speak on "New Careers, Upgrading, and Legislative Strategies." After his remarks, he has agreed to answer questions. It gives me great pleasure to introduce Congressman Scheuer.

New Careers and Upgrading Legislative Strategies

Honorable James H. Scheuer

Honorable James H. Scheuer: I would like to begin today by briefly reviewing the origins of the New Careers program. As you know, the Reissman and Pearl book viewed the New Careers concept as a basic change element to reform and recast our human services system. On the other hand, the Automation Commission report conceived of New Careers as a mechanism for creating more jobs and providing better public service but said little about the need for a public service revolution. When I became interested in New Careers as the Chairman of the Full Employment Committee of the Democratic Study Group we looked at the problem from the point of view of 2.5 million unemployed, several additional million persons underemployed, and approximately five million jobs in public services that needed to be filled. We were not thinking along the esoteric theory which the Reissman-Pearl book outlined but rather matching people with the jobs that needed performing in the public service.

Legislatively the scene has unfolded rapidly, since we first passed the New Careers amendment in 1967. I have had a number of academic and other public figures come to Washington for consultation and advice in procedures for improving these activities. We have planted the seed of the New Careers Program in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (by encouraging the expansion of the teacher-aid concept), the Higher Education Act, the Vocational Education Act and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Our main target of opportunity this year is the Health Manpower Act and if we can germinate that one we will really have done something. We have tried to formally incorporate the New Careers concept in the pending welfare legislation. Unfortunately we were unable to get appropriate language in the bill while it was in the Ways and Means Committee and our efforts to include language in the Committee report were also unsuccessful. Since the bill will come to the floor under a closed rule, that prevents our putting in the kind of amendment that we were successful in putting into the poverty program. Therefore, our last hope is for a planned colloquy on the floor of the House and I have let Chairman Mills know that I intend to get time for this purpose. I hope that we get the right kind of answers and the type of colloquy which will make adequate legislative history. That brings us up to date on the legislative origins and the current situation.

Now lets turn to some of the problems with New Careers. The resistance of established institutions is a major difficulty. Colleges are still reluctant to change admission criteria. But there is a thrust for more open enrollment and colleges across the country are beginning to recognize the demand for post-secondary education even from people who haven't benefited maximally from secondary education. I think the colleges now feel they are under some obligation to make up for the desperate failings of our secondary school system. In my

Congressional District in New York City, I am happy to say, we now have a two-year junior college, the de Hostos Community College, unmistakably designed to train people for New Careers--in the classic sense of the meaning--in public health and education. It is located adjacent to a new education park, that has schools with classes from kindergarden through the junior college level, as well as the new multi-million dollar Lincoln Hospital. Thus it will have as an integral part of the college campus these two great New Careers laboratories in the fields of education and health services. But the opposition, or rather the reluctance, of the university to respond to New Careers is a problem.

The Civil Services by and large have insisted upon the rigid maintenance of many irrelevant criteria for jobs. The experience and education requirements have kept many of the aspiring poor out of the Civil Service. The professional's antagonism and indifference are all familiar to you. Many teachers are reluctant to have a second adult in the classroom as a teacher aide who, though less qualified and receiving less income, is communicating far better than she with the constituent population. Another example is the nurse who even though she complains about changing linen, serving food, keeping temperature charts and giving aspirin, becomes extremely defensive when you ask her about redefining her job description so that somebody else can do those things.

Associations of school and hospital administrators have resisted the basic changes needed in their institutions to enable them to meaningfully use New Careerists. The professional training schools need to come to the realization that in order to properly train professionals in education and health services, they have to also train neighborhood aides to work under the supervision of these professionals and to teach the professionals, as part of their basic training, how to utilize the enormous latent skills and talents of the paraprofessional.

One of the interesting things that we have done in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is an amendment that requires local school agencies which utilize Title I funds for the employment of paraprofessionals to include an orientation and training program for the professionals who will supervise those paraprofessionals. Now I would be the first to admit that this amendment is honored more in the breach than in the observance, and I have to say "mea culpa" because that is the job of Congressional oversight to make those words meaningful. But that's part of the job we'll be doing in the year ahead.

I think I'll skip the rest of my outline and get on to the questions and answers. Before I do, however, I have to express some reservations about the less than total support the New Careers program has received from the academic community. Your position paper, Improving the Nation's Manpower Efforts, endorsed the concept of a comprehensive manpower package but I am concerned about the approach if the experience of New Careers under the CEP program is typical. I believe that you respect and endorse the New Careers concept generally but in CEP it has been watered down and the program began to respect numbers more than quality until it was stabilized at the lowest common denominator of on-the-job training and opportunities for promotion and advancement. This experience of seeing New Careers diluted, stretched out, watered down, and weakened under the CEP umbrella has given me a great deal of concern about the rightness of a comprehensive manpower program. I am a graduate of the Harvard Business School and Columbia Law School. Everything in my background as an administrator, businessman, and a lawyer respects organization charts and wants to carry a logical idea to its logical conclusion; and thus leads me to believe in the concept of an integrated comprehensive manpower program. I have been talking to Jim O'Hara about the need for this ever since the first week I met him when I was sworn into Congress. Since then, however, I believe I have learned that organization charts on the wall are not the whole story; that what happens out in the field is important; and that where you have a program which is as sophisticated as New Careers it takes a great deal of thinking and concern on the part of the administrators to make it work. It has to fight the monumental inertia, if not the entrenched opposition of the establishment institutions. All of these diverse goals can't be washed into a comprehensive manpower program with much chance of its surviving because the only thing that will survive is the concept of numbers, employing the most people at the greatest possible speed in what will be meaningless dead-end jobs. I hope that you will do some thinking about this so we can devise some kind of an approach that is consistent with our purest thoughts about variety within unity. But we must preserve the essence of the New Careers concept which I think we all believe in and all have confidence in.

CHARLES A. MYERS: Congressman Scheuer has provided a model of brevity for our subsequent speakers. We will now have an opportunity for questions. Sar would you like to begin?

SAR A. LEVITAN: Congressman, in your efforts to develop a legislative history on the floor of the House, would you please indicate to us the thrust of the colloquy about New Careers you intend to develop with Congressman Mills. For example, what kind of programs do you envision can be developed for a woman on relief with barely an elementary education? What kind of educational and training programs would you develop for her? How long will they last and at what costs? It seems to me that if you outlined these details, then Congress could avoid the rhetoric of New Careers and look at the substantive problems.

CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. SCHEUER: Well, Sar, when you produce a colloquy on the floor of the House you really don't go into that kind of detail. What you ask is, "Isn't it the sense of the Congress that these shouldn't be dead-end jobs without hope of advancement and with no opportunity for on-the-job training; and isn't it really the intent of the Congress that these jobs will be meaningful jobs in the public service, that will dignify the individual, provide him with a sense of contribution and a feeling that society values his efforts; that he will have opportunity to improve his skills and perhaps to rise to responsible jobs within the administration of the program and perhaps ultimately a few of them to professional status." And Mr. Mills, hopefully, will say, "of course that is what we meant."

You don't go into a lot of details about funding, administration, and guidelines. That's just not the way you use the device of the colloquy. Sar, what I would like you to do is write the kind of question you would like to see me ask and we'll go at it that way. I've already asked Russ Nixon to do it. If any of you folks have some ideas as to the language for questions you feel need to be asked of the Congress give me your questions.

CHARLES A. MYERS: Congressman you are probably correct in saying that our latest policy statement stressed the comprehensive concept and the idea that particular local communities may best be able to develop the kinds of programs that meet their needs. Now as I listened to you I got the impression that as far as New Careers is concerned you felt it would be buried in other programs designed to get people immediately on jobs regardless of the quality of those jobs.

CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. SCHEUER: That has been the experience of the program and this is a bipartisan remark--it is not aimed at the Nixon Administration--Russ Nixon and I were badgering and harassing the last Administration just as worriedly as we are harassing this Administration. Johnson was playing the numbers game and Nixon is continuing to play the numbers game. I think its endemic in any kind of a large-scale so-called comprehensive manpower program.

CHARLES A. MYERS: Well,then,if one of these three bills or some new bill should ever be passed (and I suppose that's an open question), how would you say the New Careers part of it should be funded? Should it be federally funded and administered?

CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. SCHEUER: No, I don't think it can be federally administered in fact the current New Careers Program is not federally administered. I do believe that it ought to have a separate legislative integrity. The O'Hara Bill has a section that anybody in this room would recognize as the New Careers Program as we know it now. The language is clear and unmistakable; it has its own standards and guidelines which are absolutely first class. I might also say that the first guidelines which the Department of Labor issued on the New Careers Program went right to the heart of the program. But in the implementation, especially as incorporated into the CEP program, the spirit of the guidelines was lost. There weren't jobs at the end of the line, the counseling and support of the agencies dwindled, the on-the-job opportunities for training weren't real, and the whole thing just got watered down, stretched out, and diluted. The program not only has to have a separate legislative integrity and separate funding but also a separate administrative identity at the community level.

MYRON JOSEPH: Congressman,you mentioned the watering down of the New Career's concept in CEP. Perhaps this suggests that some of the ideals you outlined are impossible requirements for a realistic program and may in fact create excessive expectations among participants. If you insist on strict guidelines for upgrading then don't you run the risk of creating an artificial program which may exist largely because there is money for it. It seems to me that we may be killing off a more meaningful and realistic program by looking down our noses at jobs which actually are an improvement for those who take them and provide them with dignity though they don't have the necessary skill ladder requirements that promise a pie-in-the-sky at the end.

CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. SCHEUER: I'm sorry you asked that question because now I'll have to make another speech. First of all, I believe that in a pluralistic society there is room for both kinds of programs--the WPA program during the 30's didn't have much in the way of on-the-job training or opportunities for promotion and advancement but it was a tremendous program. Nobody can demean a program in my eyes by pointing to it and saying that's the old WPA. WPA served a very useful function because it got people out of the gutter, off the corner selling apples, and gave them a job, a sense of direction, and independence. But there are also people who don't want a WPA type program,including most of the youth. In my Congressional District

I can't fill the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps slots in outdoor maintenance with Blacks and Puerto Ricans. You know who I fill it with? With college kids on vacation because they know where they are going and don't mind temporarily doing this kind of work. They know they are bound for professional careers and the purpose of summer jobs is just to make a couple of hundred bucks to get back in school. But I can't get blacks and Puerto Rican high school dropouts to take those jobs.

There has been a change in our society. People aren't satisfied with just any job as they were a generation ago. Now a job must be meaningful to the individual. Now you say these programs haven't really been very successful in furthering these objectives. I heard a lot of talk about that yesterday when we considered the District Crime Bill. Several people noted the continued failure of three-time losers to take advantage of the opportunities for rehabilitation and correction which we provide. Since they have failed to take advantage of these great programs in our penal system then why shouldn't we sock it to them for life. Well,anyone who knows anything about the criminal justice system in this country knows that we don't have a viable program for rehabilitation and correction. Our system for handling the juvenile offender is also inadequate. If some kid takes a joy ride in a car, breaks into a chewing gum machine (which incidentally is a crime of violence) and is accused of necking with a fifteen year old girl, it could conceivably make him three-time loser and under the Bill that we passed last night it could send him to the pokey for life. Three quarters of all the teenagers who bump into the criminal justice system will come back within two years for a more serious offense. We spend ninety-five cents out of every dollar for a juvenile offender on his maintenance and custody and only five cents on his training and rehabilitation. Then we say, "Look what we've done for these kids and they failed to take advantage of these great rehabilitation opportunities."

In fact, we say this of all our remedial programs, "Look what we've done for these people." We ought to have four million kids full time in the Head Start Program but we only have 230,000 year around. This is what people are saying all across the country. Look at all the wonderful programs we have, yet we still have delinquency, we still have unemployment, we still have high school dropouts. What good does it do, maybe we ought to cut out the programs. I would argue that we ought to look at the programs we have developed to see if they are really designed to do the job we want before we start saying that we ought to stop making the effort. Maybe we ought to give more than lip service to the job. Let's make an effort to do what we claim needs to be done and give these programs a real test to develop the empirical evidence that it does or doesn't work.

I don't want you to think I am so emotionally and egotistically committed to my program that I am blind to its problems. If the New Careers Program doesn't work on the merits I'll be the first to say let's try another approach and I'll try just as hard to have a Scheuer label on that too. But I don't think there is now enough evidence before us that this program doesn't have merit for some people who are really motivated. In my Congressional District at the Hostos Community College we have 30 girls enrolled for a registered nurse course. I was at the original ceremony in 1967 when these girls registered in a nurse's aide course and they went from nurse's aide to nurse's assistant to licensed practical nurse and now they are registered for an RN course. A few experiences like this are enough to convince me that there is merit for some of the poor, for some of the disadvantaged, for some of the hard-core unemployed, for some of those on welfare. Given the chance they can really make it. We also ought to have the other programs that don't emphasize promotion and advancement through on-the-job training, with the extra effort and commitment required, for those people who want to have dignity and the security of work per se patterned after WPA. We ought to be working both tracks.

MYRON JOSEPH: But if you insist on what may be impossible requirements for the Scheuer program such as strict on-the-job training, specified skill ladders, etc., then it seems to me you are unduly limiting the kind and nature of the program.

CONGRESSMAN SCHEUER: Possibly, but for some people that is a real avenue of escape to more responsibility, and more authority, than they could otherwise achieve. There are lots of people among our 2½ million unemployed and additional millions of underemployed who have the basic concern, motivation,and ability to break through the barriers to promotion and advancement if they are given the chance. Obviously that doesn't apply to all of the poor or hard-core unemployed and that's why the classic WPA program, which again I consider a noble label, is appropriate and valid. I don't think that we can have one program that is all things to all people. We need a pluralistic program for a pluralistic society. But don't lose the heart and soul of this program by washing it into what will be a unitary program at the lowest level of goals and aspirations.

BOB SCHRANK: In New York City we had 400 women who went into the Welfare Department as case aides and now about 220 are in college. The city put a lot of money in that program and my question is where do we get the resources to expand this kind of effort not only in NYC but the rest of the country? Are there sufficient resources to do these kinds of things?

CONGRESSMAN SCHEUER: This is a tough one. One of the reactions we are getting from cities across the country is that they can't afford these types of programs. There is a further complicating factor since most cities only get a small increase in their manpower inventory each year from new entrants into the labor force. But when we tell these new entrants about all the opportunities we are going to give them the cities say to us, "Once you start that with a new group what should we do about all these other people who are already in the establishment?" The incumbents are also frustrated by these bureaucratic roadblocks and hangups and they can justifiably complain about that guy from the outside getting these special advantages. So one of the real problems has resulted from the very success of the program. The guys already in the system who have worked five or ten years at the same level with no opportunity for advancement want to be included. If this is good for the new guys coming in, it's got to be good for the guys already in and then you're talking about awfully big money.

JOSEPH COLLINS: Could you give us your opinion of the new Public Service Careers Program?

CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. SCHEUER: I feel that the New Careers concept has been incorporated into PSC to an extent. We've had several meetings with the Secretary and the Under-Secretary in charge of manpower programs. Its had some of the problems that we've already talked about. I think our meetings with them have been fruitful in encouraging the need to make the ladders real and the opportunities for training, promotion, and skill advancement real. Russ ,would you want to comment about our meetings with the folks at the Department of Labor.

RUSS NIXON: The position the Department of Labor and Dr. Weber took was that they viewed the total Public Service Careers Program as an extension of the New Careers concept. There were some questions about both the quality and quantity aspects of the New Careers Program in PSC but generally we were very satisfied with the commitment they gave in extending these New Career concepts.

JAY FISHMAN: As a general observation I am concerned that most manpower specialists tend to consider problems from the traditional perspective of economics and fail to adequately remember the perceptions and needs of the client population. The people in the street are very legitimately concerned not just with a job as a job, but its relevance, its dignity, advancement, and where it fits in their life pattern. They have the same expectations that the middle class society because they are fed by the same television and communications media. If this is not taken into consideration in a major way no program can succeed. This perspective is a most significant function and advantage of the New

Careers approach.

LLOYD ULMAN: The thing that concerns me most is the recalcitrance of the entrenched professionals and their reluctance to change their systems and allow new procedures for entrance into the appropriate occupations. Have you considered ways to get them to change or do we just blame them and go on doing things the way we have?

CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. SCHEUER: I have been urging the Secretary of HEW and the Secretary of Labor to have regional conferences with hospital and school administrators as well as other organizations involved in the determination of curriculum and content of professional training activities. Frankly there are a comparatively small number of people who make these decisions. I'll bet there are less than 1,000 people across the country who determine the professional policy of the hospitals and universities in the training of teachers, doctors, nurses, and welfare professionals. Though the government has begun this task, the comparatively small resources and administrative efforts that need to be made to effectively influence these deciion makers haven't been made. I've been urging them to do this but it is not a job that a Congressman can do. My job is to get legislation passed. I think this is a real challenge to concerned lobbying groups and perhaps to academics like yourself. I would be happy to work with you but I don't consider that part of my role.

CHARLES A. MYERS: You have put a great challenge to us, Congressman. The concept of a promotion ladder for those who are motivated to move up was an innovation in manpower programs that you gave impetus to. This conference will be devoted to specific experiences with New Careers and upgrading which is closely related to it. Mr. Fishman's point is very well taken about the human aspects of manpower programs as opposed to what some people might think labor economists talk about. But we too are concerned about the human aspects of manpower programs and those of us who have worked in the cities have tried to think in those human terms to provide better opportunities for those who have had various disadvantages. We are indebted to you for initiating the New Careers concept; clearly it needs more push. Thank you very much for being with us.

Morning Session

Federally Supported Upgrading in Industry

Chairman - F. Ray Marshall

RAY MARSHALL: Our first speaker is Seymour Brandwein from the U. S. Department of Labor. It is difficult to keep up with Seymour's title given the current state of flux in the Department, but I think he is currently Associate Director of the Office of Research and Development. Formerly he was the director of what is now a component of that Office and in charge of experimental and demonstration projects. Seymour,it is a pleasure to have you with us.

The Search for New Ways and Means

by

Seymour Brandwein

This is a smorgasbord paper touching on a variety of points. Some are quite obvious, yet tend to be overlooked by seekers of new policy. I'm concerned that overoptimistic advocacy of upgrading as a new manpower miracle drug, and lack of awareness of what's involved in developing of new upgrading practices, may rebound to blunt attainable potential.

We'll start with several comments on current industrial practice, note barriers to change and new forces for change, then outline some of the questions which upgrading program designers have to face, and conclude by citing several demonstration projects exploring new approaches.

The word "upgrading" as used here means training and advancement of nonsupervisory workers to higher-pay jobs in the same company (or industry in the case of casual employment industries). I'm not gettin into other uses of that word, such as raising educational or skill levels for the unemployed or workforce generally, developing supervisory or professional personnel, or improving employment in low-wage industries.

To begin with, upgrading is not a new concept or practice. Employers do extensively promote from within. However, they do so largely on the basis of skills developed informally through on-the-job experience, and ordinarily do not provide formal training to qualify employees for higher work.

In many industrial settings this is adequate; men with experience may generally be able to move up to handle the work of a job opening at the next higher level.

In other situations, however, lack of specific training may mean that promoted employees perform below their potential or that employees are passed over in favor of recruitment from outside of graduates of training institutions or of persons with experience elsewhere (the man who wrecks a machine at one company sometimes becomes the "trained" man sought by another).

A key question in seeking to stimulate upgrading, therefore, is where--what industries and occupational fields--development of new training efforts might in fact make for substantially more effective performance by employees (even if they might be promoted without training) or enable qualification and promotion of employees who would otherwise be passed over for available promotion.

The second point is that differences in upgrading potential by industry exist, not only because of differences in need for formal training, but because of variation in occupational structure.

Job ladders and progression systems are possible in industries with a hierarchy of skills. But in industries with compressed occupational structure, there's a low ceiling on upward movement.

Industries which employ most workers at one low-level skill--some assembly, service and retailing, for example--offer quite limited promotion opportunity. They're major contributors to the problem of millions of workers "locked into menial dead-end jobs" in labor-intensive, low-wage industries.

At best, new programs for "vertical" (in the same industry) upgrading can meet only a small part of that problem (although training assistance to improve productivity might enable wage raises even if not higher-level jobs). We leave to another conference whether minimum wage legislation, extension of collective bargaining, new economic development aids, or other more radical policies might change industrial and occupational structure to reduce this problem.

A third observation is that, even in industries with extended occupational structures, there are limits on the proportion of workers that can be upgraded. Most structures are pyramid shaped, employing far more workers at lower-levels than higher ones, so there's not room for most workers to squeeze into the ladders to the narrow top.

A final point is that occupational structures are often simply not designed to facilitate inter-job movement. Often employees can't advance because there's no spannable relation between their duties and those of a higher job. A precondition for effective upgrading in such situations is often, not alone training, but also job redesign to permit accumulation of relevant experience in the lower job.

Relatedly, some stepups are barred by requirements of academic credentials. Employees at lower levels cannot get academic credentials on the job. For them to climb, it's necessary to have supplementary schooling or revision of customary academic qualification demands.

By and large, despite complaints about worker performance and shortages of good skilled workers, there's been no great surge of employer effort to develop in-house training to upgrade present employees. Whatever interest there is in"new" upgrading activities is not being generated by industry. At the moment, the downturn and uncertainty in economic activity, with layoffs and slackening of hiring, is one damper on any new upgrading plans.

More fundamentally, most employers have little significant formal training capability. Because they regard themselves as being "businessmen, not educators," they're dubious about taking on training responsibilities. And in any event they're reluctant to assume costs of training systems or of financing training in outside agencies. They generally believe that potential return from training investment is reduced by turnover which makes the training "pay off for other employers."

In addition, there are problems of "tradition," prejudice, and a lack of knowledge of how to train educationally disadvantaged minority workers. But many employers also appear simply to doubt that such workers can readily be trained and upgraded in any sizable numbers to perform effectively in more responsible jobs, and unless they cannot get any other workers, are not ready to try to do this.

What's new in the picture are social pressures, the government programs initiated this last decade to train the unemployed (and the fact that some inner-city firms are accumulating experience with disadvantaged workers who have become their main source of labor).

Concern about unequal employment status of blacks, and government pressures for compliance with anti-discrimination statutes, are the main prompters of new activity to upgrade minority workers to skilled jobs in equitable proportion to whites in those preferred jobs.

The government training programs, which until recently focused almost entirely on the unemployed, have been discovering that many trainees for low-level jobs will not stick with such jobs if there's no opportunity for upward movement. They're finding also that training unemployed workers for higher-level jobs creates some resentment among employed workers who are passed over for those jobs (or who rose to them without formal training). This is what underlies the introduction into the NAB-JOBS program of financial assistance for upgrading training.

Also, the increasing experience with training in the new government programs is slowly breeding a receptivity or demand for training by workers who some years ago would have been unwilling or considered themselves unable to take training.

Now, what is needed if there is to be expansion of systematic upgrading activity? One task, on which some start and obvious judgments have already been made, is to determine in which industries and occupational fields there is substantial potential for upgrading which past practices appear unlikely to fulfill, and the extent to which training and other new policies are needed to realize such potential.

A second task is to explore what, other than government insistence on change in discriminatory patterns, might make employers in such priority fields more willing and able to look to their lower-level employees as the source for higher-skill needs.

A third task is to develop needed capability for upgrading training in outside organizations or on employer's own staffs. This is not an either-or proposition, for there will not be a homogeneous national upgrading program. Answers to questions of in-plant vs. off-premises training, of company-run vs. outside training or some combination, and other program elements will have to vary by type of industry, occupational category and often by employer.

Some patterns of general applicability will develop, but to be realistic we must recognize that new generally effective patterns will not spring fullblown. Some years of probing, trial development, watching, and redevelopment are inevitable for a process of building new mechanisms reasonably acceptable to employers and unions and relevant to industry differences.

We will very much need catalytic agents to shepherd and hasten the process. The public manpower service agencies should be a key stimulating agent, but given traditional employer reluctance about direct government involvement in its operations, we have to consider employer associations, unions, community organizations, private training firms, and educational institutions each as potential candidates for enlarged roles.

Another central concern of course is financing. It seems clear that a strong case will be made for government aid to meet the financial burdens of upgrading training. But how to provide such aid, how much, and by what standards are significant policy unknowns at this point.

Let's turn now to what's involved in putting together a new upgrading program somewhere. The standard advice to identify clearly the program's purposes is vital, for receptivity and expectations of workers and employers and the specific design depend significantly on understanding of objectives.

For instance, is a particular program needed to increase numbers of workers to move up, as in case of manpower shortage, or is it needed to increase access of specific groups to limited promotion opportunities? Is it geared to immediate openings, with commitment of prompt promotion and wage raise, or is it intended for jobs which might develop gradually at some later time? Is it for one hop to a specific job or is it to be broader based for a succession of stepups or a variety of promotion alternatives?

We can't do justice here to the range of considerations in designing an upgrading training effort, but the following basic questions may helpfully illustrate the complexities involved and the need for flexibility in any national policies to stimulate new efforts. I believe too that these questions indicate what union and management negotiators may increasingly be talking about.

What will the upgrading training be for? Who will do it (what type of staff and capabilities are necessary)? Who shall be selected for such training and who shall participate in the selection?

What commitment should be made to trainees? Should the training be on the employee's own time or paid time--and should there be extra pay or other inducements to maximize trainee effort or offset incidential expenses, loss of overtime, or other problems? Should training be provided during or after work hours, and if after hours, how many hours are practical without impairing work efficiency or inducing dropout?

Where should the training be conducted--and are the facilities accessible and conducive to effective training? And what should the training content include: How much academic instruction, training in self-development and human relations skills, generalized vs. specialized skill training?

There is a body of experience offering some guidance on such questions, though it's still inadequately collected and presented. There's also been some recent growth of government-supported upgrading, including initiation of the new careers development work, but it's too new and sparsely evaluated to offer reliable policy guidance.

Let's conclude, however, by citing several demonstration projects which hopefully will offer additional useful guides for policymakers and practitioners.

One major effort has been the Skill Achievement series of projects guided by Sam Marks. His paper to the Industrial Relations Research Association in December 1968 describes what was involved and more detailed project reports are also available.

Briefly, we tested an uncomplicated concept: Use of a private organization to offer employers free (government financed) in-plant training to enable them to move small numbers of low-level employees up one notch, with focus particularly on minority workers. It also offered help to identify new or changed jobs to which such upgrading could be made and to give training to foremen on supervising of minority workers. The employers in turn were asked to provide paid time off for the training and in-plant space for it, plus a commitment for a wage increase of at least 8 percent and promotion to the higher-rated job.

Based on initial experience in three industries in New York, we undertook similar door-opening efforts to gauge employer receptivity and to refine techniques in three other cities. In Newark, we looked to the State Employment Service as the agent for this service (building into it special capability to provide it). In Cleveland, the training agent was also a government group, a unit in the Mayor's office. In Baltimore, we established a community corporation led by a cross-section of community leaders.

These projects developed what I regard as highly practical techniques for brief--generally 40 hours spread over several weeks--training (partly in skills, partly in self-development and human relations). This has been well received by employers and trainees. More broadly, it's worth noting several of the things we've learned:

Employers were dubious at first, but as initial users of this aid spread the word that it was a "good deal," employer receptivity grew. However, efforts to train company personnel to carry on such training themselves did not catch hold; except for some who had already had training departments, employers were interested in getting the free training service but not in giving it themselves. They particularly have been interested in getting more human relations (which usually meant race relations) training for supervisors.

Also, the one-step upgrading activity, while generating demand for more such activity, has not itself generated multi-step progression. Nor has a step-up for bottom-level workers customarily led to a pulling in of new hires to fill the vacated jobs. In short, we've found responsiveness to the idea of brief training for small numbers of low-level workers as a basis for giving them more responsible duties and a wage raise, but that has not automatically generated employer development of broader upgrading systems. We plan further work to see whether and how this might be made a better springboard for broader systems.

Differences between the cities appeared to be due more to the specific staff involved and other local variables than to employer reactions to type of sponsoring agency. However, the New Jersey

Employment Service has been so enthusiastic about its Newark experience, working in-plant with employers to help revise jobs and train for them, that the Manpower Administration is planning to have employment agencies in several other States try similarly to provide upgrading assistance.

A second major development effort has been in Syracuse, where the State Employment Service and Syracuse University Research Corp. focused on the metalworking industry, seeking to set up training for employees after work hours in existing training facilities.

Of 500 metal firms contacted, only 96 expressed some interest and, generally after extensive and gingerly consultation, 40 joined to have employees take such training to qualify for promotion to skilled jobs they might not otherwise get. Company interest was usually based on desire to meet anticipated skill needs, but in several instances was rooted in pressures to upgrade minority workers.

Of employees contacted, some 10 to 20 percent expressed serious interest. About 400 trainees have been enrolled in machine operator welding and mechanics courses. Early impressions report that two nights a week for some 20 weeks is about the maximum evening training workers were ready to take. The unions here generally were cooperative but did not seek an active role in selection of trainees or the training, merely reserving the right to take grievance action if questionable practice arose on promotions or other matters.

A detailed interim report, which will describe the technical preparatory work and also cover initial response in other industries, should be ready in several months, and a comprehensive report including evaluation of after-training experience and what activities are being carried forward without further demonstration funding, should be available late in the year.

We looked to unions as sponsors as major participants in inaugurating other new upgrading activities. In the hospital industry, in which training for aides and other nonprofessional personnel has customarily been negligible, the State, County and Municipal Workers and the New York City hospital system developed and ran effectively a combined half-time-work, half-time-training program to enable nurse's aides to qualify as licensed practical nurses. This marked the first major effort to fill licensed nurse jobs from below rather than solely via the route of full-time school attendance. More significantly, it touched off the negotiation in New York, in both the public and private hospitals, of employer payments for new joint union-management training funds expressly to upgrade hospital workers.

In another industry with limited traditions of formal training, the trucking industry, the TOP (Transportation Opportunity Program) demonstration project run by the Teamsters Union in Los Angeles showed that disadvantaged minority workers could effectively be trained and placed by a union in high-wage truck driver jobs customarily not open to such workers. We've had that project turn its attention to developing after-hours training for employed warehousemen and helpers so that they might qualify for their employer's truck driving openings. Early returns report considerable union, industry, and worker interest in broadening such activity.

Based on this experience, several small Teamsters locals have negotiated employer payments to a training fund, and the Teamsters and United Auto Workers have, through their new federation, the Alliance for Labor Action, contributed $100,000 in cash to help maintain the TOP project this year.

These last two projects are cited as potentially significant signs that unions, in some industries which have not had extensive training for employed workers, may start to devote increased and more systematic attention to upgrading for their members, with employer receptivity, in much the way that private health, welfare and pension funds were negotiated in the 1950s to supplement the government-financed programs.

Another particularly notable experiment just getting underway, labelled TIPP (Training Incentive Payments Program) is exploring in New York, under the direction of Sumner Rosen, the practicality of a simplified program of financial incentives for employers to develop steady long-term upgrading.

Payment to employers is based on the end product of any upgrading effort, as shown by worker pay, and not on what activities the participating employers undertake. How employers develop and administer the upgrading is wholly at their discretion. If in fact they upgrade the income of specified employees by at least a certain amount each six months, they will be paid a stated percentage of the wage raise to aid in meeting the expense of the upgrading. If the employees income is not raised, there simply is no payment. For those who are interested, a brochure and explanatory materials given to employers are available.

Other demonstration projects are trying to break in new job structuring,New Careers approaches in human service fields,and new entry and progression ladders in public agencies, but I won't trespass on this afternoon's discussion on new careers.

RAY MARSHALL: Thank you ,Seymour. Our next speaker is Samuel Marks, President of the Skill Achievement Institute. Sam is a psychologist by training and is now deeply involved with assisting private industry improve its techniques for working with formerly disadvantaged workers.

UPGRADING ISSUES AND POLICIES FOR THE SEVENTIES

by

Samuel B. Marks

A NEW POLICY AND PROGRAM PROSPECTIVE

I will not open by giving a definitive history of publicly sponsored upgrading efforts during the past decade. I would like to take this opportunity to present some of our perceptions about our upgrading experience and the program and policy posture which we feel the national manpower program must assume for the seventies.

As the major focus of a new manpower policy for the seventies, we see the shifting of national priorities away from the unemployed worker or the worker on the periphery of the labor force to the underemployed or otherwise underutilized individual.

At the core of the national manpower program we see a program policy that is at once concerned with the development of the individual within the total organizational setting, and with the creation of changes in the organization which will provide conditions in which people will achieve organizational needs best by achieving their own. That policy will also confront the issues surrounding the industrial system's takeover of many areas of education traditionally within the jurisdiction of public policy. It will also have to confront the issues stemming from the growth of educational and behavioral technology, which, when placed in the hands of management, become a powerful tool for modifying the behavior of large segments of the work force.

With its primary focus upon the worker's development within the organization and on changing the way in which the organization relates to the worker, the new policy would reverse the traditional balance in favor of training and preparation outside of the organization. The shift, while being one of emphasis and not of totality, would be marked.

We see a national manpower policy which will foster the creation of intra-industry and cross-industry alliances in defined geographical areas. The primary purpose of those alliances will be to maximize the utilization of a given area's work force. While the specific form these alliances will take remains nebulous, the motives for their formation will be principally economic and related to the continued growth and survival of industry within those areas - even though those motives will probably be publicly billed under the heading of "social responsibilities."

Building upon the historical precedents of employer coalitions in urban areas, the new alliances will be initially concerned with industrial training for specific groups within the population. After organizing around these precedents they will begin to function in the area of long-range planning for the development and utilization of the area's total work force. This will provide for the cross-industry pooling of human resources and the creation of worker skills banks. Programs will be developed which anticipate industry manpower needs as far as three years in advance. A more realistic involvement in the planning, development and total rehabilitation of the community within the alliance's area will also be an integral part of the program.

Last, we see a new manpower policy which will take into account those changes in the industrial system and the society as a whole which will alter the basic roles of our existing institutions concerned with education and the protection of worker's rights. That policy will delineate possible new roles for the educational system vis-a-vis large corporations and smaller employers, and new roles for unions vis-a-vis management and will develop and implement new methods to shape the skills and individual goals of workers.

I would now like to present to you some of the issues and questions that a new policy and program direction for the seventies must confront and answer.

Because our upgrading efforts in the past have focused on the "underemployed" worker who was defined in terms of his income, employment levels, life style and social condition rather than his underutilization, we have been forced into an experimental mold whereby our models are primarily concerned with changing the behavior of the worker and of altering his immediate work environment to support those changes which were desired.

The focus on the underemployed worker led to the development of highly effective techniques for resolving conflicts between the behavior expected of the worker on the job and that behavior demanded of him by his environment outside of the plant. This same focus led to the development of methods for intensifying certain types of skill training in-plant, and permitted the comparatively rapid movement of lower level workers to higher level jobs. Elements of those simplistic models also served to alter the relationship between the underemployed worker and his immediate supervisor.

However, the constraints imposed by this narrow focus on the behavior of the underemployed worker did not permit the development of models which provided for changing the behavior of the total organization with reference to all of its employees.

Therefore it could not deal with the total worker and his ability to realize his personal goals for growth within the organization. Certainly, the earlier approaches eliminated much of the hostility toward the worker in his immediate work environment. But, those techniques did not, and could not, modify the behavior of the total organization toward the underemployed worker. Those approaches resulted in the immediate and short-term upgrading of the worker's skills and his employment status, but they did not attempt to change the behavior of management to the extent that it was moved to implement a continuous schedule of upward mobility opportunities for the worker.

The focus on the underemployed worker was necessary, and the one-step-at-a-time model which flowed from that focus allowed for an immediate and demonstrable impact. The one-step model also permitted the public manpower effort to move cautiously into the sensitive area of in-plant training.

To continue in that same direction with upgrading, however, would be to lose perspective of the total context within which upgrading must take place if it is to have a lasting effect on the worker and the organization. To continue with the same focus would be tantamount to ignoring significant changes in management's perception and behavior towards the underemployed worker and trends in worker development and utilization within industry. It would also ignore the generational changes in the composition of the work force and the changing perceptions and values of employment.

Even as certain upgrading programs in the public sector have implemented continuous schedules to provide for the upward mobility of workers, so must models be developed for the private sector which provide for the same kind of scheduled advancement. Those new models, and the theory and technology behind them, must take into account changes in the industrial system itself and the effects of these changes on the perception of the worker by management. Other elements which must also be considered include the changing role of the employer in the community and the rise of an education and training technology which places tremendous power in the hands of an employer undertaking the development of his employees.

A national manpower policy for the seventies, particularly as it relates to upgrading, must take into account these changes and the issues which arise from them. Key among those changes will be industry's changing perception and behavior toward the worker.

Before opening my discussion on this issue, I would like to present to you a few familiar facts and opinions which will serve to emphasize the obvious for purposes of establishing our perspective:

> The 500 largest corporations in the U.S. produce half of all the goods and services available annually. 1/
>
> Industry can no longer afford to accept the products of our educational system -- it must assume the responsibility itself for the education of workers to meet its needs. 2/
>
> Unit labor costs are soaring now because wage increases have been accelerating at the same time that productivity per man hour in the private economy has actually been declining. 3/
>
> The largest employer in the U.S. (with the exception of government) employs upwards of 800,000 workers. In the next decade it will interview 30 million people and has made a major financial commitment to their training and development.

Although the above statements have no particular significance in and of themselves, in combination they are indicative of trends which are altering the very foundations of the industrial system.

The technology required for the 500 corporations to sustain an output totalling 50% of the annually produced goods and services carries with it the demands for long-range planning in the development and utilization of the work force. Even as the machinery of

---

1/ John Kenneth Galbraith, The New Industrial State. Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1967.

2/ Peter Drucker, From comments made at a conference at the Skill Achievement Institute: New York, June, 1969

3/ Richard Armstrong, "Labor 1970: Angry, Aggressive, Acquisitive." Fortune, October, 1969.

production and service delivery must be on time, on design and on cost, so must the work force to operate and service the production process be on time, on skill and on cost. Given the level of capital risk involved in these ventures and the absolute necessity that production meets forecast goals, industry literally "can no longer afford to accept the products of an educational system" which does not serve its immediate and long-range manpower needs.

Almost total predictability in terms of worker skills and availability must be guaranteed. The results? A new perception of the worker -- a perception, that while economically motivated, may offer great benefits to the worker. He is seen both as a "capital" resource, a productive unit requiring long-range investment, and as a human being whose needs must be met within the organization if he is to remain productive.

The drop in productivity which has plagued many of the same 500 corporations only serves to increase the urgency with which their respective managements are seeking answers to the problems of worker motivation and utilization. These concerns are no more vividly stated than in John Paul Jones' remarks:

> Management can lean on the door (to development) and frustrate growth, or it can open the door and help people grow. We must understand that people are motivated by their needs, not ours, and that one of our jobs is to create organizational conditions in which people will achieve organizational needs best by achieving their own . . . We must make good use of academic resources inside and outside training, and every learning situation we can devise. [4]

The same corporation which employs 800,000 workers has recently entered into an agreement with the Institute to explore means, methods and models by which workers' skills can be fully utilized and the "organizational conditions" created whereby employees can perceive the goals of the corporation as being consonant with their own. New models are being developed which will serve as powerful tools in bringing about this "goal consonance." The underemployed worker, because he is the most underutilized human resource, becomes the specific target for this program.

---

[4] John Paul Jones, "The Ties That Bind," National Assocation of Manufacturers: New York, 1969, pp 25-26.

Corporations which have begun to explore possible methods for achieving this goal consonance are fully aware that its achievement will probably involve the creation of general upward mobility patterns for all workers.

This new perception of and resulting behavior toward the worker is not limited to the industrial giants. In our experience with many smaller and middle range employers, we found the same kinds of concerns for reaching a "goal consonance" between the worker and company management, although with a lesser degree of sophistication as to how it might be achieved.

The changing behavior of management toward the worker is not without implications for the unions representing him and for the educational system. Both will be forced to assume new roles vis-a-vis the industrial system in the coming decade. With such issues as salary, working conditions, and the like dropping into the background, unions will have to search for a new role which balances advocacy for the upward mobility of workers with a watchdog role in checking against abusive worker deployment and utilization.

In undertaking a greater role in the educational development of its employees, the corporations will have involved themselves in certain areas of education which traditionally have fallen within the jurisdiction of public education policy. The social implications of an employer of 800,000 workers assuming such a role are enormous, particularly when the work force is being drawn from core urban areas. Public manpower policy must deal with the issue of corporations setting de facto public education policy without public recourse to reviewing and aligning it with national education policy. Public manpower policy in the seventies must also provide a framework within which new roles and relationships between the educational system and the industrial system can be defined.

Given the rise of educational technology in the past decade, and the powerful tools for modifying behavior of workers, employers have better tools for developing and stabilizing gigantic segments of the work force.

While immediate benefits are likely to accrue to the underemployed worker and to society as a whole as the result of major corporations assuming a larger role in education, public manpower policy which supports and initiates that role must be concerned with its longer range implications.

While these directions will certainly bring about neither the new feudalism feared by Berle and Means nor a Keynesian millenium within the next decade, a certain caution and wariness about too quickly shifting the responsibility for certain areas of education to the employer must be reflected in that policy. There will be a fine line between maximizing the society's human resources for the social good, and creating an immeasurably potent organizational serfdom in which the serfs are the captives of their own goals.

Public manpower policy must play a central role, both in easing the dislocation which will come as the result of infringement on the traditional domains of the educational establishment and in balancing the countervailing forces of unions and management, serving as a check on abusive worker deployment and other excesses from either side.

We view the foregoing statements as imperatives for developing a new national manpower policy which will confront the issues and prescribe new directions and approaches for the nation's manpower program.

RAY MARSHALL: Our next speaker is Dennis Derryck. Dennis is currently with the Metropolitan Applied Research Corporation in New York. He is best known to me at any rate and perhaps to many of you for his work with the Workers Defense League Joint Apprenticeship Program. Dennis played a major role in making that apprenticeship outreach concept very valuable--especially in devising and implementing techniques for tutoring minority youngsters to prepare for apprenticeship programs. It is, therefore, appropriate that Dennis talks with us about "Breakthrough in the Building Trades."

Breakthrough in the Building Trades

by

Dennis A. Derryck

INTRODUCTION

The construction industry represents the largest single industry in the United States. Conservative estimates reveal that the industry as a whole contributes approximately ten percent of the gross national product. Figures for 1968 indicate that the industry employed 3,259,000 persons on an average monthly basis; new construction costs for 1968 totalled 84.6 billion dollars. As an industry involving large sums of money and playing a major role in the national production output, the construction industry's posture toward minority group participation assumes major significance.

The construction industry has not always enjoyed cordial relations with minority groups. The industry has tended to see black demands for participation as an unwarranted intrustion into its private domain. The industry's insularity and resistance to change have been well publicized. Ultimately the federal government has had to involve itself in efforts to expand minority participation in the industry. Federal involvement has taken several forms, notably the Apprenticeship Outreach Programs (AOP); the journeyman training programs of Boston, St. Louis, and Buffalo; and most recently, the Philadelphia Plan. Since the major thrust to increase minority representation in the construction industry has been through the AOP, I have chosen to confine my discussion to these programs. I have examined the program in three areas: (1) AOP as a meaningful and significant breakthrough in increased minority participation; (2) AOP problems on the horizon; and (3) the future role of AOP in the construction industry.

I.

A brief look at manpower projections will indicate the expected growth rate in the construction industry and the changes necessary in racial employment patterns for the 1970's.

The recently published report of the U. S. Department of Labor, *Tomorrow's Manpower Needs*, indicated that contract construction will require 4,190,000 workers by 1975. Comparison of this projection with 1965 figures, indicates an increase in jobs of 3.5 percent over the ten year period. Eighteen classified jobs in construction listed in this report represent an aggregate annual increase of 115,800 jobs per year. 1/

This growth in the construction industry has been coupled with the clear need to get more minorities into the skilled trades. U. S. Department of Labor projections of nonwhite employment and unemployment patterns further underscore the urgency of minority recruitment for skilled positions. Between 1965 and 1980, the nonwhite labor force is expected to increase by 41 percent as compared with a 28 percent increase for whites. As Marshall and Briggs have indicated, these projected increases, coming at a time of declining opportunities in the unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, imply that significant shifts in traditional racial employment patterns must take place. 2/

The most recent available figures on racial membership in the Building Trades Unions published by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, indicate that in 1967, 8.4 percent (106,263) blacks of 3/ the total membership (1,257,929) of 16 unions responded to the inquiry. However, there are two caveats to the figures. First, the figures quoted by the Commission relate to only those unions that have a referral agreement, so that the figures for the industry are underestimated. Second, black participation is largely concentrated in just one area of construction work -- laborers. Despite the argument that there are no low paying jobs in the industry, if laborers are excluded, black membership decreases from 8.4 percent to 2.5 percent.

The 1960 Census reported that nonwhites constituted 2.52 percent of all apprentices in this country. To assist in alleviating this situation, the U. S. Department of Labor has funded approximately 55 outreach programs. These outreach programs are designed to recruit, prepare, place and follow-up minority youngsters in the AOP of the building and construction industry. As of June, 1969, these 55 outreach programs had placed approximately 4,800 minority group members in craft unions at a total cost of 3.8 million dollars. 4/

Thus the statistics background and manpower projections present a rather mixed picture. With this ambivalence in mind, let us move to closer examination of the AOP. We will examine the question: are the efforts of the AOP programs indicative of a breakthrough in the building trades?

The area of entrance requirements is one important criterion of change that can be considered a breakthrough. If entrance requirements do not change it remains as difficult as before for minority group members to become apparentices.

The seventeen AOP programs operated by the Workers Defense League and the A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund report that what limited changes in requirements have occurred solely in extending the age requirements and lowering of the educational requirements and that these changes tend to be in the crafts that generally have problems in recruiting apprentices. 5/

Another measure of change in the industry concerns the relevancy of apprenticeship. What requirements are being applied for the approximately 125,000 individuals who enter the industry yearly by means other than the apprenticeship route? In essence, are we dealing with a set of double requirements when we are concerned with black entry into the trades? While the industry is increasing its work force by approximately 150,000 each year, apprenticeship programs in the construction industry only account for approximately 27,000 workers out of this total; therefore, the question of other routes of entry becomes significant.

Construction unions exercise almost complete control over entry into the building trades through the closed shop arrangement. Most major construction jobs contain union security provisions which require employers to hire only union members or persons approved by the unions.

Apprenticeship, organization and direct admission are the three main ways by which an unskilled, non-union worker becomes a skilled union journeyman. The unions and most of the contractors consider the first method the most desireable of the three, even though most journeymen enter by other routes. The second method, that of organization, occurs when men who are employed by non-union contractors become union journeymen when the contractor signs a collective bargaining agreement with a union. The third way, direct application, is the most important source for many trades. When a worker with a non-union company applies for admission to a construction union, he is usually given a performance test. If he passes, he is ordinarily accepted as a journeyman. If he fails, however, he may be required to become an apprentice or he may be given the special temporary status of "improver" (i.e., non-apprentice trainee) until he passes the journeyman examination or becomes discouraged and quits. In other cases, unions issue "permits" which allow non-union men to work on union jobs on a temporary basis by paying fees to the union.

While no national figures are available on method of entry into the trades, figures for Detroit (Table I) indicate that a relatively small number of the construction journeymen for this city entered unions through apprenticeship. Most workers reached journeymen status by direct admission to the union and obtained their training in the non-union sector. Some learned the trade in vocational schools and others worked their way up from an unskilled or helper classification through the process known as "stealing the trade." In some cases it is possible that some who started as apprentices dropped out of the training program and applied for direct admission. The fact remains that apprenticeship may be the most desirable means of entry because those who receive it are more likely to advance to supervisory and management position; however, apprenticeship remains the least important of the three routes in terms of the number of men trained in the industry.

TABLE I

Method of entry into the various crafts in the city of Detroit.

Craft	Method of Entry	
	Apprenticeship	Direct Admission
Bricklayers	50%	50%
Carpenters	15%	85%
Electrical Workers	70%	30%
Glaziers	10%	90%
Iron Workers	unknown	unknown
Lathers	66%	33%
Marble-Tile and Terrazo workers	50%	50%
Painters	5%	95%
Pipe Fitters	50%	50%
Plasterers	50%	50%
Plumbers	75-80%	20-25%
Sheet Metal Workers	35%	65%
Sprinkler Fitters	75%	25%

Source: Michigan Civil Rights Commission, 1966

In summary one can therefore conclude that apprenticeship per se, the concern of the AOP Programs, has not been as significant a breakthrough as published figures would lead one to believe. Institutional changes that may have occurred have not resulted in any proportional change in the number of minority individuals now entering the industry; requirements within the apprenticeship programs have in many cases remained irrelevant. Moreover, the numbers enrolled in apprenticeship programs remain somewhat constant. In short, Apprenticeship Outreach Programs are undoubtedly caught in the dilemma of irrelevant requirements, limited numbers of openings, and keen competition for these few openings. All of these factors limit the goal of the AOP programs in placing qualified minorities into the industry, for they are operating through the channels that account for the smallest number of individuals who enter the industry.

Other approaches are being attempted to increase the number of minorities in the industry, but the fact remains that the current emphasis is on outreach programs to the extent that they may be doubled in the next year. This AOP emphasis raises the question of basic long-range objectives. Do we want an increased percent of all blacks entering construction as a whole each year, or an increase in the number of minorities entering the industry through apprenticeship? We clearly want an across the board increase in the number of blacks in the industry and since more than 80 billion dollars are spent annually in the construction industry, the economic gains minorities can make through the apprenticeship system are limited.

II.

The role of the AOP program can probably best be defined as an attempt to increase the number of minorities in the apprenticeship programs and thereby train a limited number of "key men" in the industry. This goal can be justified in the light of the large percent of apprentices who eventually move to supervisory and management jobs in the industry. What then may be some of the problems facing Apprenticeship Outreach Programs?

The problem of dropouts. The early experience of the Workers Defense League (WDL) project indicated that the competition involved in selection for apprenticeship was keen. Early analysis of the backgrounds of those selected for the sheetmetal class for the spring of 1965 was as follows:

Type of Diploma Received	Number of Recipeints
Academic	21
General	21
Commercial	7
Vocational	4
No diploma	4
High School equivalency	2
Mechanical	1
Technical	4
Other	1
Total	65

Furthermore, of the 64 whites accepted to the program, twenty-five had spent between one and five semesters in college. This necessitated highly selective recruiting techniques if any inroads into the apprenticeship system were to be made. During the early period, WDL enjoyed a high degree of success in tutoring its recruits. Moreover, for the first two years, each placement became a personal victory for its staff members and follow-up was a relatively simple task.

During those earlier days dropout rates of six percent were quoted rather proudly, especially when one considered the options exercised by the dropouts. However, these rates have increased noticeably both in WDL programs and other AOP programs. Vernon Briggs reports that the overall dropout rate for AOP operations is now approaching 23 percent, consistent with the regular dropout of apprenticeship programs nationally. As Briggs continues, "the gravity of the situation surrounding the placement of minority youths in apprenticeship during these years of transition in racial employment patterns demands that AOP sponsors pay more attention to the dropout problem." 6/

Part of the dropout problem is attributable to the fact that AOP programs tend to select the talented minority youngsters. The very success of these programs in opening up new horizons for the minority individuals account for part of the attrition rate. Through increased exposure provided by AOP, minority youngsters see other options that they may exercise and do so.

Another major contribution to the dropout problem may have to do with the very structure of the AOP operations. The AOP's are normally manned by three-man staffs, comprised of an administrator, a recruiter and a tutor. Each of these functions is more than a full-time job, but as the programs expand and placements are made on a larger scale, the function of follow-up on apprentices is added to an already over-burdened staff. Perhaps the answer is a new staff position exclusively for apprentice follow-up. Closer examination of this relationship among staff functions, the increasing number of placements, and growing dropout rates may be needed as these programs succeed.

Sponsors of AOP. Currently AOP programs are being sponsored by four different groups. The Workers Defense League and the A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund currently sponsor 17 AOP programs. The Urban League, through its Labor Education Advancement Program (LEAP), sponsors an additional 22 programs; the local Building Trades Councils, 16; and various other local community groups support a total of eight programs.

Sponsorship on the part of the Building Trades Council can be justified by the fact that they can more easily achieve cooperation with individual unions. While it may be somewhat early to pass judgment, it is important to note any differences in performance existing between those programs operated by the Building Trades Councils and programs operated by the other three sponsors of programs. In theory it can be argued that community based organizations can better build the bridge between the minority community being served and the white community that has traditionally controlled the industry. To the black community, there exists the distinct possibility that a program sponsored by the Building Trades Council and staffed by ex-building trades officials or members representing a vested interest group perform a paternalistic function.

Published figures on the percent of indentures who were black by program sponsors indicate that the programs sponsored by the Building Trades Councils indentured 60 percent, Urban League 83 percent, WDL 89 percent and miscellaneous sponsors, 75 percent. 7/ The fact that the programs sponsored by the Building Trades Councils have the lowest percentage of minorities placed may be indicative of the degree of credibility that they may have in operating AOP programs.

III.

The future of Outreach Programs. The AOP programs do have a role to play in the future task of increasing minorities in the building trades. This role, as indicated earlier has to do with training of minorities so that they may begin to fill key supervisory and management positions. Two objectives AOP programs cannot achieve are: (1) satisfying the manpower needs of the industry, and (2) placing enough minorities in the industry to satisfy the wishes of the minority community's desire to share in the largest industry in the United States.

In the future, AOP Programs will have to be coupled with journeymen recruitment efforts if they are to place significant numbers of minority group persons in the industry. The legislative language of Model Cities and its future role in journeyman recruitment efforts will necessitate AOP broadening its recruitment base so that it may reach a larger segment of the community that it is not reaching at present because of apprenticeship requirements. Lastly, the AOP programs must begin to address themselves on the questions of entrance requirements, length of training and procedural type questions. These goals or issues cannot be accomplished without the cooperation of the Building Trades Councils. When these issues are resolved and these goals accomplished, and when minorities truly share equitably in this large sector of the economy, we can truly address ourselves to the questions of a breakthrough in the building trades.

Footnotes

1. Tomorrow's Manpower Needs, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 1606 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969), pp. 24-25.

2. See, F. Ray Marshall and Vernon Briggs, Jr., The Negro and Apprenticeship (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1967), p. 4.

3. "Racial Membership of Building Trades Unions, 1967," a report of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

4. "Minority Placements in Apprenticeship Programs Through the Apprenticeship Outreach Program Cumulative Through July 30, 1969," Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor.

5. This assessment was made by Mr. Charles Bremer, Assistant Director of the Workers Defense League in February 1970.

6. Vernon Briggs, "Black Entry Into the Apprenticeship Trade: Lessons of the Sixties and Prospects for the Seventies" Paper prepared for a manpower conference at Indiana University, (March 20, 1970) p. 24 (mimeographed material).

7. Ibid., p. 14. Source of data was confidential, but Briggs says that he has "confidence that it approximates reality."

RAY MARSHALL: Our final speaker is Eleanor Gilpatrick who is Director of the Health Services Mobility Study, Research Foundation, City University of New York. Some of you know of her work on structural unemployment. She has also recently authored *The Occupational Structure of New York City Municipal Hospitals*, a Praeger publication. Her topic today is "Technical Support for Building Job and Educational Ladders."

TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR BUILDING JOB AND EDUCATIONAL LADDERS

by

Eleanor Gilpatrick

The Health Services Mobility Study is funded by OEO, Labor and the Public Health Service. The topic of my presentation, "Technical Support for Building Job and Educational Ladders" describes our project. We are designing and testing a methodology which can be viewed as a technology for designing job ladders and the educational ladders needed to carry people up the job ladders. Our support function lies in our teaching the method, helping others to use it and reporting our own results. Our method is generic to any industry; however, we are working primarily with hospital jobs.

You have before you a two-part document. The first will be more or less adhered to in my oral presentation. Since I did not wish to take the time of these short 15 minutes to describe the methodology which we are developing in detail, this is done in the second section of the document you have before you. Suffice it to say that our method is based on the assumption that, if we could identify and rate the skills and knowledge which are required in job tasks, we could develop promotional ladders within institutions which would reflect the interrelatedness of tasks. This would take advantage of the transferability and hierarchical relationship among levels of skill and knowledge, and would minimize the amount of training effort required to move people up within organizational contexts.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

I wish to step back from a description of our approach for the moment and direct my main attention to the key issues, as I see them, which surround the relevance or possibilities for successful implementation of any technical support we could offer. Two of the issues are highlighted by language in the Conference agenda itself; I will raise two others with you as well.

Why New Careers?

The title of this Conference is "Upgrading and New Careers," and herein lies a problem. I should like to make it very clear that I do not endorse the concept of new careers, per se. The reason is that I object to this stress on the word "career" and the stress on the word "new." I think that these qualities could be side effects of what is done in the area of manpower development, but they cannot be the points of origin. What I mean is this...if you conceive of industry having labor requirements for the production of goods and services, with the proportions of jobs needed to produce these goods and services increasing in the middle and upper skill levels, then we can understand why we find increasing shortages in the middle and upper skill levels, and hard core unemployment a continuing problem. The health industry is a prime example of an industry with growing shortages at levels which require educationally-based skill and knowledge training--much of it credentialed, and few low level shortages.

It becomes increasingly important for institutions to be able to draw on their own internal labor forces so that their people at bottom levels can move up to fill these deepening higher level shortages.

In such a context the word "upgrading" is meaningful and the words "job ladder" are meaningful, but the words "career" and "new" are not necessarily meaningful. It may be that an upgrading sequence truly offers the quality of "career" at the end. But to talk about entry level jobs or those one step up as "careers" is clearly a misnomer and a euphemism. And whether or not the restructuring which often is required for building ladders necessarily produces something new, is really a function of the goods and services which are demanded, as these change, and the technologies used to produce them, as these change.

Given this context, "upgrading" has a meaning in terms of the organic requirements of industry (in any kind of a market economy, free or otherwise). The focus would be, in such a context, on the provision of technical support to permit industry, both public and private, to make maximum use of existing manpower with a minimum amount of training time involved.

Training workers for entry level (or para-professional) work, then, is put in its proper focus: as a response to newly opened entry level jobs which have been vacated by upgraded workers--and not the originating push against the already impacted, entry-level employed poor. This is a different context, I suggest, than the one which is the basis for much poverty legislation. That approach views the poor as unemployed, as hard core, and as handicapped, and set out to provide jobs in an economic vacuum,ignoring organization or labor market functioning in a context of altruism.

An Industry Is An Industry

My second objection to language is in the same vein. It relates to the fact that this No. II Session is called "Federally Supported Upgrading in Industry" and Session IV is called, "New

Careers and the Service Sector." The idea that industry means private sector, non-service; that you don't have an industry when it is service or public sector, is totally alien to my thinking as an economist.

It seems to me that every industry, private or public; every industry, goods-producting or service-producing, has got to put together labor and capital and management know-how in the production of goods and/or services. To differentiate among these in terms of one's manpower philosophy,I believe, leads us down the wrong track. It has made it possible, it seems to me, to separate what is being done in manpower development in the service sector from the hard thinking of cost analysis and of systems approaches. I think that this is a disservice, not only to manpower policy, but to the people and organizations involved.

I have the abiding faith that, if a solution is inorganic and not appropriate to its context, it will not be long sustaining or self-sustaining. And if it is not long sustaining, and if government manpower policy has been build around fostering programs which are not essentially self-sustaining in organizations, then we face the danger that the entire attention to having a manpower policy will be discredited. What should be discredited are ill conceived programs which do not reflect the realities of industrial and human systems.

Job Ladders and Educational Ladders

Our methodology starts with task analysis of the work being done in the organization. After job analysis and job ladder design we will be identifying the curriculum ladders needed for the upgrading of the employees involved. At this point we run into another major conceptual problem.

It has been traditionally assumed that when someone is going to school he is not a worker, and that when he is a worker he is not going to school. Labor force participation has been considered to be essentially incompatible with educational participation. This means that the educational system, per se, is not geared to the needs of employed workers who may be studying on a half-time basis in preparation to moving up in a related skill and knowledge hierarchy. It also means that educational programs are all terminal in concept: at the high school level, in a technical school, in a community college--and even beyond. This creates redundancies in curricula requirements for upwardly mobile people. For example, the nurse aide is trained, but gets no advance standing in a Practical Nurse School. This PN is trained, but gets no credits towards an associate degree in nursing (RN). The associate degree nurse has great difficulty getting two years of advance credits in a baccalaureate nursing degree program.

All of this has separated "training" from "education" to the detriment of those who are required to have formal education to reach the upper level jobs in their industry. Another result is that the educational system itself has not really seen its function in the whole area of manpower development. In addition, government legislation in the field of manpower development has not been built around the existence of educational institutions (formal, credentialed educational institutions). Please notice that there is not one educator here today.

I am setting aside for the moment the questions of whether credentialed occupations and those which require formal higher education require these for prestige or because the skills and knowledges can only be obtained that way. I think we can show that there are sufficient numbers of industries in the economy which more and more have need of educationally-based skills and knowledge.

The separation of legislation into manpower bills and educational bills, with the same people never being seen as coming under both, puts an undue burden on the employer. He is faced with the problem of training workers who require credentialed training. It has also made it possible for much manpower money to wind up in the pockets of over-night-created "training" organizations which offer neither credentialing nor articulation with the educational system. The training that lower level workers receive essentially gets them no further than the immediate applicability to the immediate job (if it is applicable at all, and if there is a job at all).

Part of our function in offering technical support is giving advice on strategy. We suggest to hospitals that they get out of the business of producing educational services. As purchasers they can combine their efforts and obtain credentialed training in the sequences which they require, and with the elimination of redundant requirements. However, we would be greatly aided by a national commitment to such an approach.

The systems approach to developing job ladders, if it entails the development of curriculum ladders to go with them, would change the focus or context in which federal manpower policy is formed, and rechannel the flow of program money. Legislation can begin to demand that training be a step on the way to further training and that it be articulated just as job ladders are articulated, and tied to such ladders.

In the course of our work, we designed a nursing sequence which presents a classic example of the kinds of problems facing upgrading programs.[1] The nurse aide-practical nurse-staff nurse ladder is obvious and is not based on our job analysis method. We show, however, eight different kinds of tracks which individuals in the hospital system could follow to go from nurse aide to staff nurse. Some include remediation. Staff nurse requires the RN license and the associate level degree or higher or a three-year diploma. Among these eight tracks are several which could take the nurse aide to the practical nurse level but which, at the point where she is a practical nurse, has her half-way to the associate degree level in nursing.

It is now impossible to implement such a design through one piece of legislation, only one government department, or without institutional changes in educational institutions and state education departments.

Fragmented Support

The employer has to cover two kinds of costs: payroll costs and education costs. He either must maintain the salaries of trainees studying on a release-time basis and pay for relief workers, or face a reduction in output. He might try to apply for stipends for his trainees so he can pay only for time worked. There are then the costs of paying for the training. Even free public schools will have to finance expansion of plant and faculties with large enrollment increases.

At the present time there is no single piece of legislation that will pay these costs on a regular basis--or help in some interim period. At least four different pieces of legislation, administered in different departments at Federal and State levels would have to be involved.

Legislation and the educational system offer a separate place for remediation, a separate place for skill training for lower level jobs, a separate place for professional training; there are stipends for hard core unemployed, stipends for people in skill training; but there is no help or money for relief workers or tuition money for employed workers who are going to school on a release-time basis. There is no incentive for the educational institution which would have to expand facilities and faculty in order to accommodate the needs of employed workers in their upgrading sequences.

[1] Our Research Report Number 1, "Train Practical Nurses to Become Registered Nurses: A Survey of the PN Point of View," reports this work. It will be published in 1970 by the Hospital Research and Educational Trust (Chicago).

Thus it would take an enormous amount of imagination and political pressure to develop the kind of organic programs outlined, ones which essentially cost the least amount of time and effort to implement--because they minimize the training time and the relief time necessary to bring people from the entry level to the upper levels. At the moment, I find that the institutions simply do not have personnel with the training, orientation or imagination needed to design funding proposals, to carry out the steps, and do the interlocking planning necessary to implement any kind of upgrading sequence which is built on educationally-based ladders.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT

Having said all this, I think I can move on to the relationship between the kind of technical support which we offer and what we have learned to be the most serious problems we face in the implementation of anything that might be proposed out of the methodology which we are developing.

We offer technical support in the sense that, having designed the methodology, we collect our own data and will be designing job ladders for the institutions that we are studying. As a spin-off of this we will be identifying the curriculum needed to carry people from one job to the next-higher related job, in a sequence of jobs within skill families. The technical support lies in the specific recommendations. We will also offer another kind of technical support. We are and will be training organizations to use our methodology. We expect to continue to be funded in a way which will permit us to train people to go back to their own organizations and apply the method.

We also must offer another kind of technical support--based on the existence of the issues which I have outlined. We have discovered, for example, that, having designed a job ladder, having identified the necessary training steps, we must also help an organization understand the need for institutional changes to make implementation possible. In addition, we have found that it is almost beyond the possibility for any institution to come up with people who can put together a package for implementing the kinds of proposals we are suggesting--for the reasons we are suggesting. I would like to see federal manpower policy change enough to make at least the latter kind of technical support unnecessary.

I suggest to you that fragmented legislation, with emphasis on entry level training rather than emphasis on upgrading sequences, without attention to the real costs of employers, dissuades employers from planning to help themselves. And I suggest to you that there is now no impetus for the educational system to really face up to its responsibilities in training the labor force of this society to operate its technology.

We have essentially abandoned our generation to the effects of miseducation and malplanning in the face of very rapid changes in the composition of manpower requirements. If we do not make a strong turnaround on these issues I suspect that we will be facing more and more serious upper and middle level shortages, and we will not be answering the upward mobility needs of the employed poor or the unemployed.

I urge you to help create legislation which requires that the educational system become a partner in manpower planning and development; to free funding allocations so that manpower programs can accommodate industry's organic needs for upgrading its own labor force through formal educational institutions where this is appropriate or where it is required. I cannot urge too strongly this re-emphasis. It then makes it possible for the kind of technical support that we offer to have some meaning and to have some hope for implementation.

Part II

THE TASK ANALYSIS METHOD OF THE HEALTH SERVICES MOBILITY STUDY

Our job analysis method is being developed in such a way that the results can be used to create job ladders which are logically related and which require a minimum of training time between steps. It will also make it possible to rationally restructure jobs, design curricula, evaluate performance, and do manpower planning and development.

The Health Services Mobility Study (HSMS) provides a method of job-task analysis which is unique in many respects. First, it starts at the level of the task; second, it identifies and rates the skills and knowledge needed in job performance; third, the rating scales and the skill and knowledge categories are applicable for use in any industry; fourth, it identifies the skills and knowledge found in inter-personal activities as well as in manual activities; fifth, the method is empirically sound. All aspects of the method, including scale construction, have been or are being subjected to rigorous statistical field testing and analysis.

Another unique part of the HSMS approach is that we help to provide strategies for use of the method; we recognize that institutional change is required if the method is to be put into practice; we know that users will require assistance and guidance. We know that there must be changes in educational institutions as well as among employing institutions which are understood and accepted.

Our project is unique in that it provides an opportunity to demonstrate the extent to which a government funded technical capability can influence organizational change in both the public and private sectors. By virtue of a funded service capacity and by virtue of the Project's ties with hospitals, schools, trade unions and other institutions in the health care field, it can be expected that all or some of the work of the Project will be translated into actual job ladders, upgrading training commitments and appropriate educational offerings.

THE METHOD

The method, as it is applied in the field, draws on both observations and interviews. Job analysts, working in teams of 2 or more, observe people performing their regular work duties and then interview them to obtain information about work which was not seen and about other information required.

Concepts

The basic unit of observation is the task. A unique definition of the task has been developed and tested in the field. The task is to the job what the atom is to the molecule.

Tasks require the use of various kinds of skills and knowledge which can be learned and are therefore relevant for job ladders and curriculum design. Skills and knowledge can be required in low or high degrees, and can be expressed as scales on which any task can be rated, just as a ruler can be used to measure length.

A skill is displayed in action, in the carrying out of a mental or physical activity, and can be rated in terms of its degree of intensity. Knowing how or why things function or what to do to things to make them work is knowledge. Using the knowledge requires skills. 1/ That is, one may know how something works, the principles

---

1/ In contrast, aptitude refers to the ease with which an individual can learn or apply a skill.

of why it works or what to do to it to make it work, but one needs skills in the act of applying the knowledge in a task.

Our method incorporates a knowledge classification system which reflects the ways in which knowledge is used at the level of the task. The way in which our categories are designed will provide for maximum transferability across task situations and will affect the way job ladders are formed. Aggregative disciplines will not be separately identified. They will be formed by combining their separate component categories. Once a knowledge category is identified for any task, the category becomes a task dimension. All relevant categories will be identified for all the tasks being studied.

The skills and knowledge scales along which tasks are to be rated are referred to as dimensions. The word "dimension" is used to mean a measurable, variable attribute of tasks. The term "dimension" is broadly used and applies to any task attributes which are learnable.

Each of the task dimension scales has a name, an overall statement of its content, and an indication of what criteria are used to differentiate each of the various numerical levels on its scale.

The dimension scales along which the tasks are to be rated are like measuring instruments. The scale values are represented by numbers from 0.0 to 9.0. Each scale value is defined on its dimension by its descriptive statement. (The scale values assigned to statements were determined in a series of tests.) The descriptive statement which best applies to the task being considered determines the scale value of the task on the dimension in question.

The descriptors at all lower levels on a scale are present in all higher levels on that scale. Therefore, the scales are cumulative. (They have also been tested for this quality.)

Field Use of the Method

The method begins by identifying all of the tasks found in a group of jobs (or all the jobs in an organization). Each task is then evaluated on 18 task dimension scales and on all the relevant knowledge categories.

We developed the task dimension scales because, having identified tasks, rating all tasks on all relevant skill and knowledge categories will provide the information needed to cluster tasks into related families and hierarchies of inter-related attributes. The clusters of tasks will reflect attributes which are learnable.

The data for a task results in a profile. Factor analysis is then applied.

APPLICATION

Our task definitions were designed to identify task units which can also serve as building blocks in job structuring or redesign. Duplication of tasks which appear in several jobs can be identified, and redundancies can be eliminated. The scaling information makes it possible to see which tasks in a job are at higher levels and which are at lower levels so that discrepancies can be eliminated. Jobs can be rationally structured to incorporate tasks with related skills and knowledge and common levels of these skills and knowledge.

The results of the factor analysis will make it possible to develop prototype skill and knowledge families because we will know which skills and knowledge categories are interrelated. We will be able to develop prototype job ladders because we will know which tasks are related through skills and knowledge.

Any institution will be able to use our scales and job analysis methodology to collect its own data and develop its own skill families. We will produce a job analysis manual for use in the field and a manual with which to train job analysts. We also expect to be funded to train job analysts in the use of our method for those organizations who wish to have job analysts on their own staffs.

As an alternative, since we will be reporting the results of our own data collection, an institution may wish to apply our prototype job ladder recommendations to their own organization, allowing for relevant modifications.

Our method will be of great use as technological change occurs in an organization. Once the job analysis data are collected, our method can be used to identify the best occupational group to perform the new tasks which utilize the new technology. All that need be done is to analyze the new tasks. A search is then made for those existing jobs which are closest to the new tasks in skill and knowledge content and levels. Trainees would be selected from this occupational group.

Our method makes possible the most efficient use of time and educational resources. It forms the basis for identifying the building blocks needed in curricula for the jobs. Since the skill and knowledge dimensions are all attributes which can be learned, and since they are scaled, the knowledge and skills needed for a set of tasks (a job) can be compared with the education and curricula required by credentialing agencies or employers. It will be possible to isolate irrelevant training or pinpoint inadequate training. It will also be possible to identify overlapping training in existing curricula.

The task profiles can be used as a basis for performance evaluation, and may make possible more objective ratings. Each scale level represents an implicit norm. The performance or output of the task would be evaluated in terms of these norms, rather than the performer's personality or other subjective criteria. Thus, for example, a worker performing in isolation need not be rated for sociability.

The work of the Project has long-run and short-run features. In the short-run, hospitals and unions anxious to get underway in developing job ladders and upgrading training are able to benefit from our orientation. We advise them not to waste training resources in one-step sequences without planning for meeting credential requirements further up the line. We have the opportunity to help them plan for training sequences which account for the steps below and the steps above jobs through several alternative routes.

In the long run these programs can be refined and amended as the job analysis methodology is applied to job redesign. Jobs analyzed at later stages will show links which can become alternate job and educational pathways. But the original ladders are not invalidated as new information is added.

We also say that an organization has much to do before it is ready to utilize our methodology. It must first collect a good deal of basic information. It must then be organizationally prepared to utilize job analysis and career ladder designs.

Information about employment, titles, vacancies and obvious ladders are necessary to an understanding of the existing structure. On the other side of the equation, a sound program for training requires an inventory on all personnel--detailing the education they already have and its form of accreditation as well as the results of diagnostic tests. These tests must also be selected to provide maximum compatibility with those used by educational institutions. Diagnostic testing screens people out before hiring, but it is needed for the design of remediation programs once employees are in the system.

The design of employee counseling programs, preparation of supervisory personnel, and preparation of union stewards will be necessary because manpower development requires major changes in attitudes and functioning and these do not come about automatically. Middle management must be ready to work with upgraded staff; stewards must be prepared to deal with new grievances.

RAY MARSHALL: Upgrading is in many ways like Appalachia. I've done a fair amount of thinking about it and I couldn't figure out what Appalachia was until it finally occurred to me that it doesn't really exist as a single concept. Appalachia is really many different things. I wonder sometimes if that is not also the case with upgrading. It is difficult to conceptualize, and that tends to be frustrating to those academicians, intellectuals and program people who are concerned because they need to think systematically about the factors influencing upgrading. Now with that introduction, Seymour, and given that the 1960's were years of experimentation,what have we learned about the kinds of things that work and don't work in upgrading people?

SEYMOUR BRANDWEIN: I believe this policy conference is premature. The initial effort required, because of the complexity you mention, is to categorize types of upgrading practice, to gauge potential for expanded efforts, and to identify obstacles and likely side effects in trying to fulfill what we regard as needs. With that, we would have a framework and base for identification of issues for a policy conference.

As far as the 1960's are concerned, there was little conscious focus on upgrading. The experimental and demonstration program did undertake several diverse operational efforts designed with a high degree of flexibility, essentially taking relatively simple concepts and finding out what was involved in fielding them. In my prepared remarks I briefly identified several such efforts, and their reports indicate what does and doesn't work on specific types of upgrading efforts. We've been slow in collecting and interpreting the materials that have been developed but in the near future, time and resources permitting,we hope to identify more specifically the generalizable learnings from these and other efforts.

FAIL OSBORNE: Has any experimental sort of work been done in the area of seeing whether increasing the dollar amount at lower level jobs makes them more attractive as an alternative to upgrading?

SEYMOUR BRANDWEIN: No. We have briefly considered it but simply are not equipped to experiment with changes in wage structure to see whether the elusive thing called job satisfaction, which has been identified as one of the concerns of the 70's, really can be met in some cases by income alone without regard to contents of the job.

ELEANOR GILPATRICK: I think that may be an irrelevant question, given the change in employment by occupation that I see will occur in the 1970's. To bring people into entry level jobs by increasing their wage level is essentially saying, "Hang on for another five years, man, and then you get laid off because your job no longer exists." We owe it to our own technology to train a labor force to work it, but that requires extensive education these days. There is also a moral question about whether you want to support sweated industries. It seems to me that the government is supposed to redirect the focus of policy as opposed to helping out industries that would be going out of business anyway.

GERRY SOMERS: Running through most of the papers--especially Mr. Marks' and Miss Gilpatrick's--is the notion that industry isn't doing very much upgrading, and therefore, the government has to get into the act. I wonder whether we really know how much industry is doing. The key question the economist always asks is what is now going on; what is the value added? Before the government starts spending money for this on a large scale we need to know where we stand now. We did a casual survey this summer and although it wasn't designed to get at this particular question I was surprised to find out how many companies were making payments to outside agencies to train and upgrade their workers. These were mostly manual workers, and I'm sure that if we got into the managerial and professional sphere there would be much more of it. Do we have any good data on this?

ELEANOR GILPATRICK. Do you mean upgrading training or skill enhancement training? That makes a difference.

GERRY SOMERS: It was training of existing employees. I'm not quite sure what it was for. I presume it resulted in some upgrading.

SAM MARKS: It's a valid question. I don't think we have good empirical data but I feel that if we start to look we will find that some companies are and some companies aren't. I do have a sample of 200 organizations which tells me that there is no systematic upgrading process. The companies include hospitals, restaurants, and varied manufacturing plants. Of course upgrading can also be carried on informally with people moving across departments or up the hierarchy by chance but I don't know of any research that would substantiate this either way.

CHARLES A. MYERS: You're right on that point but I think it's worth emphasizing that studies by Doeringer and Piore, first published by the Manpower Administration, do point out the tremendous amount of on-the-job training which is conducted informally in connection with new technology. The way most people move up in private industry is through learning on the job, watching people who are in more skilled occupations. Those of us who have been arbitrators are familiar with claims made by certain individuals that they are qualified on the basis of past experience, and some additional training, to be promoted; or that perhaps seniority hasn't been given enough attention in terms of background. I think we need to know more about this.

But while I'm on my feet, it's interesting to me that we have an economist and a psychologist sitting together and apparently not talking the same language. I don't deny, Miss Gilpatrick, that there is an important cost-pressure which affects the decisions of employers relating to their training and upgrading programs. But I'm also impressed with what Mr. Marks said as a social psychologist about the differences which result from management philosophy. I do a lot of work with management people in M.I.T. executive programs and I have been impressed with their differing attitudes toward advancement. I'm an economist and even though the cost-pressure may be important I'm impressed with the fact that the way in which people have an opportunity for self-development in an organization is in part a reflection of the way in which managers view people at work. Now how do you associate these two views which I thought were different?

ELEANOR GILPATRICK: My approach stems from viewing the push of economic pressure on the system and relating this to desired goals. The bulk of employment in health (that is employment, not titles) requires less than high school education. About 2 percent of employment and titles require high school education only, and all the rest require not only formal education, but credentialing. Hospitals have always trained; but they waste their resources by becoming producers of educational services. They should become buyers of educational services and force the educational system to give them the trained people they need. No institution would be interested in upgrading if there were no shortages or problems about the inflated prices it has to pay for skilled labor. But if an industry does face labor shortages, then it becomes the job of people offering technical support to help the institutions see how they can draw on their own internal labor force. I think this can be done with minimal cost, given certain kinds of strategy design. I have been impressed with the fact that an organization that needs technical support needs it partly because it has not perceived questions in this way. There are all kinds of vintages of management, and they need all kinds of help or change, but I think that the economic pressure of unfilled vacancies is really the major push that will make the other pieces of policy fit. I would like to see government offering technical support, including strategy design, and let the institutions solve their own problems once they have adequate knowledge.

CHARLES A. MYERS: I don't think any economist would deny the economic pressure, but we've talked a lot about under-utilization of already employed people. Unless you assume that every enterprise, private or public, is at the maximum of efficiency, then, as Mr. Marks has suggested, there is a lot of under-utilization of people.

SAM MARKS: There are several points I would like to make. First, there really is no reward structure built into most organizations for helping people grow. Reward structures tend to be based on productivity indexes. The telephone company has a whole set of indexes on how fast a girl can put out a light on the switchboard but no one gets rewarded for formal upgrading or even informal upgrading so there is no propensity on the part of any one to do it. During World War II Drucker encouraged IBM to pay a supervisor X number of dollars for upgrading an individual; it worked very well and very fast. Secondly, supervisors may tend to hold better people back. They find a good person in a department and they don't want to let him go so they don't recommend him for additional training. Thirdly,organizations, whether they are given government funds or whether they do it on their own, are still struggling for better ways for promoting growth. I don't think the state-of-the-art, the tools or the techniques, have really been developed. We haven't done enough experimentation and I think the larger companies, at least two of those that we have been associated with are now saying they can start to develop innovative ways of improving human resources rather than continuing with the current band-aid approach. The "consultant" is the person who borrows your watch to tell the time for you and doesn't return it. This has been recognized by some of the organizations that we've been thrown out of.

RAY MARSHALL: We were diverted from an earlier question which Gerry Somers raised about what we know about private training and Seymour Brandwein wants to respond to that.

SEYMOUR BRANDWEIN: Upgrading may or may not be an answer but actually we haven't figured out the questions yet. I would like to note another effort underway. On the assumption that many companies have informal relations with outside educational organizations, we have undertaken a community-wide project through Rutgers University and the New Jersey Employment Service to explore with employers and unions what they perceive as their unmet educational needs. It is seeking to identify the educational opportunities, money, and facilities available in the community, a county in New Jersey, and then to develop the hookups for workers interested in taking advantage of community facilities for training both for self development and for specific skill preparations. At the outset, it's fair to say, a number of companies are at least intrigued and perceive some current need. The study is also examining union management relations on such upgrading, and how jobs in which upgrading and training are being provided have been filled in the past. Sometime late this year its report should be available.

BASIL WHITING: We funded a casual six month survey of about eleven industries and their upgrading practices and came up essentially with what has already been said. It is very difficult to measure the costs that are being incurred in training because so much of it is on-the-job and varies widely from industry to industry.

SIDNEY FINE: We've known for a long time that we don't have a homogeneous labor market. The industrial manufacturing labor market operates in one way, the crafts area operates in another, the civil service, which is very substantial, operates in still another way. There are systems or traditions for upgrading (which means promotion) and transfer. In the civil service you would find that many of those in the middle grades started at a much lower grade and those at very high grades perhaps started at some middle grade in the system. Another factor that we haven't touched upon is that very large numbers of people are not really interested in upgrading, per se. Many people in secretarial and typing jobs are not particularly interested in promotion but just in getting more money and better conditions with perhaps just a little more responsibility. We mustn't think that upgrading is something that necessarily applies across the board. Union agreements often prevents systematic upgrading arrangements. The steel industry, for example, has 32 grades with most people entering at the laborer level though it is conceivable that people can go all the way to level 32. They may have to do it by hook or by crook, which incidentally is one of the most common upgrading systems or non-systems, but it is one that exists and one that applies to many workers. But there are more formal upgrading systems which attempt to integrate the employment and the educational systems. This occurs mostly in the professional area, however. It doesn't exist throughout our system. We have closed off many sectors and eliminated people from this process.

SAM GANZ: I think many large firms in private industry are beginning to take another look at how to more effectively utilize their current work force in order to increase both productivity and profitability. I believe that industry is beginning to say to itself, "Let's look at every person we bring in and determine his optimum potential for the company." The need for this approach has been reenforced because of collective bargaining agreements containing pension, welfare, retirement plans, etc., which tend to lock the employee into the company and increase the investment the company has in him. Therefore, such companies are now attempting to upgrade their workers to increase their effectiveness and enhance their own investment. In this process, the tie-in to education is really important because educational improvement is frequently a prerequisite for upgrading. This can be done not only within the educational establishment's regular programs but also by bringing educators into the company in what frequently are the equivalent of high school and college faculties and by offering courses to the employees in a variety of ways.

MYRON JOSEPH: One question which we haven't made explicit is the appropriate role for public policy and public expenditure in the provision of training and upgrading. Given market constraints the private sector is beginning to perceive the profitability of increasing its manpower efficiency through better hiring, better screening, better long-run planning of manpower training, increased internal mobility, etc. As firms find it profitable we're finding consultants rising up and saying "Aha,fellows,not only is it profitable but look I can show you ways in which to make it even more profitable." All I would say is, "good luck," to the consultants--that is good enterprise and I hope they are successful. But that raises the question of why is the government involved in this and what is the appropriate function of government? Through this whole discussion, no one has made any reference to people like Becker or Mincer who note that on the individual level we do find evidence that in addition to investments in human resources by firms, individuals make substantial investments in their own training and upgrading. Some of this is not observable, or not easily observable, in the sense that people accept lower paying jobs if those jobs are perceived as having elements of on-the-job training and substantial possibility of upgrading. Thus I would argue, Gerry, although for other reasons, that one may want to look at how much out-of-plant and in-school training is going on.

Finally, we get to the question of what is the government doing getting involved at all. It seems to me the government has at least two functions: To operate in the area of the public sector--that is, in that sector where the possibility of profits does not exist as the spur to do something dramatic, for example, in hospitals. Why should a hospital try to restructure its jobs or improve its manpower efficiency? The consumer has no alternative, and little power to obtain reforms that might reduce costs. As long as there is no real pressure analogous to that in the private sector, hospitals are unlikely to substantially increase their manpower efficiency. In this non-profit area, government subsidy and external push have a legitimate and important role. Public policy has another role in helping individuals who fell below an acceptable minimum or who were handicapped in their ability to function within the economic system. Government efforts should not help firms be more efficient. That is what firms ought to and can do. Trying to improve positions of identifiable groups of people--particularly the blacks and other disadvantaged groups--is the relevant role for manpower policy in this area of upgrading.

ELEANOR GILPATRICK: I think it is a mistake to condone a government policy of spending money to "help" certain people who are viewed as "handicapped" rather than seeing them as inadequately trained but needed by the system. As long as white liberals get legislation passed to "help" poor blacks, poor Indians, or poor Puerto Ricans in a context of altruism these people are not going to be self-sustaining in the market. A viable policy of manpower development which has the government's support has to be something which will result in self-sustaining participants and a self-perpetuating, continuing process of manpower development as a part of the market's overall functioning. The 1960's was a period when we said"let's do good for all these poor people," while at the same time this society was in desperate need of qualified manpower to man its technology. The pieces were not fitted together. Unless we gear manpower policy at the federal level to reflecting the market system and helping it where it is floundering,we're going to miss the boat and wind up scuttling all manpower policy instead of that which is based on altruism and should be scuttled.

SAM MARKS: I would also like to respond to that question. I think the Becker study is largely confined to middle-class whites' involvement in education. You would be surprised to know that most companies fund tuition remission programs. But these are not used by entry-level workers--blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans--but rather guys with existing degrees going on for higher degrees. I think your question is a good one in the sense that we came here to talk about future manpower policy and the appropriate government role. I think a government alliance with private as well as other public sectors should develop a social laboratory for learning more effective techniques. We don't have good analytical models for evaluating what's going on; our talk about motivation, job task analysis, and job restructuring occurs only in glittering generalities The real world is a beautiful laboratory and I think government should develop a public policy which encourages alliances between the public and private sectors to find more specific answers to these problems.

S. M. MILLER: I find this discussion very confusing. It seems to me that there are fundamental differences between the Gilpatrick and Marks approaches. Yet I suspect there is no difference in what they want to do tomorrow. I don't find the connection between the way they look upon the problem and the kinds of steps that they want to make. I would like to hear what different steps you would take today and tomorrow because of different theoretical perspectives and because of the different political perspectives which underlie these theoretical perspectives.

ELEANOR GILPATRICK: I didn't know we had a difference.

S. M. MILLER: A very simple difference. What you want to do is repeal the discovery of the 60's,i.e., that we do not have to accept the outcome of the labor market as given but to take that as a variable which could be affected by concerted government policy because demand is not narrowly set by technology. Your emphasis is completely in the opposite direction, to go back to the way we started in 1960--like the Automation Commission Report in 1965--which is to take the technology as given, demanding only a certain kind of labor force, and further, accepting the notion that formal education is an effective way of producing people who could move into these jobs. That's one side; the other side, implicit in Marks' approach, is the notion of investing in individuals to see that they have effective kinds of jobs--and jobs which are satisfying--which is quite alien to the notion that the market is the predominant way of influencing things and that the market has to decide. I can't figure out how you and Marks differ in terms of action--what you both want to do. Perhaps for each of you there is a big gap between theory and language, on one side, and your recommendations about practice on the other.

ELEANOR GILPATRICK: That is the trouble with a fifteen minute presentation. I won't speak for Sam, but in my approach the fundamental decision-maker is the employer. Let's help him develop a pathway for his labor force to use the technology he has or will have as it evolves. The process of providing training for people for upgrading requires a whole turn-around of the institutional structure of the organization. The more an organization needs our technical support the more they require institutional change to put it into place. In that sense Sam and I are not competitive, we are supplementary to each other. He is essentially oriented, I believe, to turning around management's institutional perceptions, and I'm geared to providing the soft-ware technology that will give it an economic base. On the other hand, I believe that we disagree to this extent: Sam thinks that what is good for the worker is good for the organization; I believe that in the case of upgrading and filling vacancies what is good for the institution happens to coincide with what is good for the workers. But I wouldn't trust management to develop the "whole man." Nor do I think they could. Finally, I don't think it is any of their business.

SAM MARKS: A great concern is the frustration that exists because no cost/benefit type models exist. How to become very person centered while still meeting the needs of the organization--probably is still an enigma. I think Eleanor brought us very close together. I hope we satisfied Mr. Miller.

CHARLES A. MYERS: Dennis Derryck's paper interested me very much and no one has yet asked him a question. I would like to have a little elaboration of something that you said on page 10. You indicate that as a result of their experience with AOP many minority youngsters became aware of additional options that were available to them even if they dropped out of apprenticeship. Could you give us some examples of this?

DENNIS DERRYCK: One of the things that the youngsters learned was just basically moving through the bureaucracy. We encouraged a number of applicants to return to school. Many of the youngsters enrolled in WDL began to go to college at night and made A's and B's in their courses. All of a sudden, they wondered why hang around here,so,they quit WDL. One of our best enrollees got into a fight on a particular job. Since it was a second offense he realized that the judge was really going to throw the book at him. The union suspended him and to look good to his parole officer he enrolled in college. By putting things off he was able to complete two semesters at City College with a total of 24 credits--all straight A's. Now this was a youngster with something like a 70 average in high school. One of the fall-out effects of going through the WDL program was that many of them,on their own initiative, took exams for a variety of white-collar jobs. They learned to handle the whole system and discovered that there were other kinds of jobs in New York City. Many decided they didn't want construction in cold weather even if it did pay $6.00 an hour. Instead they decided they would rather work in an office with a white shirt, jacket and tie.

RAY MARSHALL: One of the hopes of many of those involved in the apprenticeship outreach effort was that success in negotiating the initial steps of the apprenticeship program would lead to other more fundamental changes. Somebody who successfully entered the program would then get the habit of success. I also understand some people selected by the outreach program have completed apprenticeships and have become contractors. It was felt that if you could get a successful operation going, you could cluster other things around it. Now WDL is attempting to develop alternate routes to get journeymen into the building trades unions. Do you see those hopes being fulfilled by the outreach effort?

DENNIS DERRYCK: I would say that the Apprenticeship Outreach programs did begin to show options to the individuals and in that respect it did succeed and it was a base upon which to build genuine efforts. I have to react in terms of dealing with minority youngsters and my gut reaction is why go through all of these changes just to be able to open up a few alternatives. In the first two years of WDL they had roughly forty youngsters drop out and twenty of them went on to college. I keep asking why it is that they had to go through AOP to prove themselves before they recognized their higher potential?

LLOYD ULMAN: Is there an alternative or supplemental outreach program that will allow non-union minority journeymen to join the union.

DENNIS DERRYCK: I don't know of any effective government or private foundation efforts though I've spent the last six months working on this aspect of the problem in Detroit. The biggest problem there is developing the non-union sector. Every single black electrician in Detroit was trained by a black, non-union outfit; and every single individual, as soon as he was trained, was stolen by the unions simply because the unions were more competitive and they had to expand membership to meet their commitments. The black contractors' biggest problem is expanding the amount of work that they can do given their manpower problems and to surmount the legal problems they face with bonding, meeting FHA Housing and Davis-Bacon requirements, etc.

LLOYD ULMAN: What about other non-union methods?

RAY MARSHALL: Lloyd, I think the answer to that is that it varies a good bit in different parts of the country. In the South most of the residential work is non-union. Training institutions like Texas Southern University, Tuskegee Institute, Hampton, and others have turned out many craftsmen who have gone to Detroit, Cleveland, and other places. But I think you put your finger on the key element in breaking these barriers down and that is a supply of trained people. Once you get them trained and they become competitive you don't really have too much of a problem. How much of that non-union effort is going on is hard to say. I know a lot of people in different parts of the country are thinking about it, as they are in Detroit. It depends on what you mean by non-union. In some cases they form black unions to be competitive. I would suspect that most black contractors are non-union.

BOB SCHRANK: We all know about the Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Philadelphia plans which gives black building trades workers credit for the time they have worked as part of their journeymen status. There will be a training component to help these new black workers improve their skills. My question concerns who will do the training? Is it going to be done by the existing institutions such as BAT? What is happening to the new training possibilities that I see in those agreements?

DENNIS DERRYCK: I am trying to find out what is happening in Chicago myself. I don't know the answer at this particular time. I guess the only model that we have functioning is in Boston. You have all the problems of supervision on the job and not only the institutions that will be doing the training but just exactly how to place X number of people on jobs knowing the hazards and the roughness that can exist on construction jobs and be able to have these people survive.

BOB SCHRANK: What would you like to see happen?

DENNIS DERRYCK: First of all I think the whole problem of identifying the number of blacks who have particular skills in jobs isn't as easy a task as one would think. I have spent considerable time in Detroit trying to identify blacks with particular skills. You can't get the payroll of the black contractors because they are concerned about another contractor stealing his men. The largest plumbing contractor in Detroit has eight plumbers and he protects them with his life; he won't give out names, won't show payroll, nothing. Maybe we must set about changing the whole concept of what it takes to train an individual in the construction industry. I think that is the real gut issue. Unions think we are subverting the system with something like the Boston program. Well,I don't think you are.

ROBERT SCHRANK: I don't consider the problem that Dennis is discussing really an upgrading problem. It's a discrimination problem.

RAY MARSHALL: But discrimination is a very important upgrading problem.

ROBERT SCHRANK: Here is an example of public policy applying pressure on industry to change its practice. The industry is trying to respond. However, as Dennis has indicated,we need further change. We need to develop some new ways to train plumbers instead of four or five years of wiping lead pipe joints when we don't use lead pipe anymore.

RAY MARSHALL: I want to thank the panel and the rest of you for your contributions to the discussion. It is now time to adjourn this session. We appreciate each of your contributions.

Luncheon Address

Russell A. Nixon

INTRODUCTION - CHARLES A. MYERS

Perhaps we can continue with our regular program. As you know, Russell Nixon is now professor of social policy at Columbia University. He has had a career that has encompassed New York, MIT and Harvard Universities where at the latter he tells me he once had John F. Kennedy in some of his classes. I've known Russ since about 1939. During the war we were both engaged in the Labor Division of the War Production Board and thus interested in another type of manpower policy, to encourage private industry to convert over to war production. We are pleased to have you with us today, Russ. The time is now yours.

LUNCHEON REMARKS

Russell A. Nixon
Columbia University
and
University Research Corporation

This conference on Upgrading and New Careers organized by the National Manpower Policy Task Force is particularly important and timely. It is most fortunate and appropriate that the planners of the conference chose to link "Upgrading and New Careers." I am sure this was done to emphasize the desirability of a close and reinforcing ing interrelationship of these two program thrusts -- to seek ways and means to clarify and constructively develop the potential of that relationship in the interest of more effective national human resource policies. Indeed, it may well be that one of the most important consequences of the New Careers program has been to help waken the sleeping giant of upward vocational mobility for millions of workers who have been tied down by the hardening arteries of our established vocational system. As a recently released study of the American Foundation on Automation and Employment found, in eleven major industries one-third of all non-supervisory jobs were "dead end" jobs.* This report emphasized the worker's dissatisfaction at lower job levels which this lack of upward mobility caused, and urged unions to give serious attention to upgrading.

It is the linkage of the entry level of New Careers with the general internal personnel structure that has caused the greatest problems for the New Careers program. The program's success and clearly demonstrated potential has been notable in the creation of entry routes into new public service job areas for the hitherto excluded, disadvantaged, poor, marginal/secondary labor force. It has been possible to innovate, to break some barriers, to recruit and place a significant number of effective new workers at the entry level. But when the steps beyond entry are confronted, when the climb up the ladder of mobility is really to begin, the New Careers program has floundered and only limited and illustrative successes are reported. New Careers has been able to turn the key of entry through the front door, but has found it hard to get beyond the vestibule since the other rooms are either locked or have very sticky doors. As the National Committee on Employment of Youth concluded in its recent study for the Department of Labor of "Roads and Roadblocks to Career Mobility for Paraprofessionals":

> ...this large national experiment in the creation of "new careers" is in danger of remaining stalled

---

*Grinker, William J., Cooke, Donald D., and Kirsch, Arthur W., Climbing the Job Ladder -(American Foundation on Automation and Employment, E.F. Shelley Co., Inc., N.Y., 1969).

> at the level of deadend jobs. The major failure has been the inability to provide new careerists with opportunities to advance through career ladders beyond the entry level.*

The N.C.E.Y. found that a credentials barrier, the insistence upon a college baccalaureate degree for major advancement, remained as the major obstacle to upward mobility. Dr. Oscar Ornati stresses "discrimination, which is rationalized in terms of insufficient education and skills" as perhaps the major cause of lack of upgrading of minority workers.** The Evaluative reports of the General Accounting Office of New Careers Programs in various cities as part of Title I-B of the Economic Opportunity Act stress the lack of funding and the failure of state and local governments to institutionalize job and career opportunities after initial Federal support ends. I would add a special emphasis on the effect of fiscal austerity and program retrenchment as a basic factor militating against upward mobility--New Careers and upgrading require a tight labor market and significantly expanding public service employment openings if their potentials are to be adequately tested and realized. We manpower economists have let the assumption that 3.5 percent unemployment is "full employment" get by too easily. This rate doesn't mean a tight labor market in the ghetto or among the minority and other disadvantaged population. It doesn't mean generalized upgrading is adequate. Such a rate doesn't mean full opportunity in the labor market.

Without question, New Careers concepts need to be generalized for all lower level workers in an agency or a service system. The original advocates of New Careers did not adequately recognize this point, and as so many of us have done, failed to recognize that the entire marginal/secondary labor force has a common character and integration and is not well described by distinguishing employed and unemployed, or even "in the labor force" and "not in the labor force." Any idea or program that involves creating a new elite of New Careerists who will push pastthe already working poor has to be summarily rejected. This problem, and the need of generalizing New Careers concepts for all workers, applies especially to service areas such as health where large numbers of low paid workers are already employed. It has less urgency for systems lacking such working poor employees and where entirely new categories of potential paraprofessional jobs are being created by new service dimensions such as expanded day care, Head Start, family planning, and the new outreach and service efforts in vocational rehabilitation.

---

* National Committee on Employment of Youth, Where Do We Go From Here?, mimeographed, December 1969.

** Ornati, Oscar in "Preface" p. VII to Haskell, Mark A., The New Careers Concept, Frederick A. Praeger, N.Y., 1969.

The necessity of linking New Careers and general upgrading certainly makes the problems of New Careers much more complex and difficult. At the same time, as with the Department of Labor's Public Service Careers Program, this linkage vastly expands the potential of New Career concepts--nothing less than the entire personnel process of the labor market becomes involved. Moreover, it is easier for government to legislate and program entry level New Careers jobs for the poor than it is to deal with the subsequent internal mobility structure. This is especially true of the private sector, profit or non-profit. Perhaps what is needed is a carefully planned and monitored system of inducements and assistance to employers and unions to develop upgrading and vocational mobility.

In any event, in jointly focusing on New Careers and upgrading, this Conference defines an urgent problem, the sum of which is greater than these two parts. They need each other, even though the courtship and marriage may be difficult.

In addition, attention to New Careers by those primarily concerned with overall manpower issues rather than with specific New Career program involvement is important both because of the wide legislative base built for New Careers and because of the need even at this very early stage for a preliminary evaluation of the initial accomplishments and failures, the promises and limits of this concept.

Although many earlier precedents can be cited, the basic New Careers legislation is the amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act in 1966 sponsored by Congressman James H. Scheuer (D-N.Y.). This provision has been reaffirmed and reemphasized by Congress in the 1967 and 1969 OEA Amendments and constitutes the legislatively defined New Careers concept.* At the end of 1969 Congress doubled the limited authorization of funds for New Careers, linked Operation Mainstream and New Careers, and repositioned these programs in a new "Part E-Special Work and Career Development Programs" added to the Economic Opportunity Act" Title I-Work Training and Work Study Program." This section states that:

> The Congress finds that the "Operation Mainstream" program aimed primarily at the chronically unemployed and the "New Careers" program providing jobs for the unemployed and low-income persons leading to broader career opportunities are uniquely effective; that, in

---

* It is relevant to note that it is the same two committees--the House Education and Labor Committee and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee--which originated the New Careers legislation, reaffirmed it in several Reports, and added it to a variety of other legislative enactments.

> addition to providing persons assisted with jobs, the key to their economic independence, these programs are of advantage to the community at large in that they are directed at community beautification and betterment and the improvement of health, education, welfare, public safety, and other public services; and that, while these programs are important and necessary components of comprehensive work and training programs, there is a need to encourage imaginative and innovative use of these programs, to enlarge the authority to operate them, and to increase the resources available for them.

The OEO Director is authorized to provide funds "to stimulate and support efforts to provide the unemployed with jobs and the low-income worker with greater career opportunity" in Operation Mainstream and in New Careers which is described as:

> A special program to be known as "New Careers" which will provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields of public service including without limitation health, education, welfare, recreation, day care, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for on-the-job training, promotion, and advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which gives promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement.*

Several Republican members of the House Labor Committee disagreed with this particular 1969 majority action in Congress which re-emphasized and raised the status of the New Career and Mainstream programs, but New Careers has enjoyed bipartisan support from the outset, and no major open controversy developed on this issue.**

---

* Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969

** U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Report No. 91-684, Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969, November 22, 1969,.pp. 37-56.

New Career provisions have been added to the Vocational Education Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and to the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968. In other social legislation such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act and the Education Professions Development Act, and the Public Assistance Title of the Social Security Act (The Harris Amendment) special provisions for the utilization of non-professional manpower have been enacted. The Department of Labor has enlarged and defined the potential scope of its New Careers--upgrading program in its Public Service Careers program which adds a Federal and local Civil Service, and a "grant-in-aid" dimension to its plans. In the Department of Health, Education and Welfare an Office of New Careers has been established to coordinate and advance Department programs, and the Offices of Education and Vocational Education have special career development units in operation. In a number of anti-poverty programs New Career developments are under way, and in a variety of other human service agencies at Federal, State, and local levels such programs are being developed under existing legislative authorizations. It must be pointed out, however, that many of these efforts are still at the discussion and initial planning stages. In many cases programs are limited to the simple use of aides and other non-professionals with little or no career development content. Funding support has so far been extremely limited. It is much too early to evaluate these newly developing programs.

In addition to the above legislative actions already taken and adding to the timeliness of this Conference, is the fact that Congress is now considering alternative proposals for comprehensive manpower legislation and the wide-ranging Administration "Workfare" Family Assistance Plan with its employability process aimed at "suitable" jobs for an estimated 1.1 million welfare additions to the labor force. Incidentally, does this registration suggest a coincidental increase in the labor force of one million, and until actual placement occurs, a rise in total unemployment of around one million persons? Congress is considering a variety of other important potential New Career related social legislative proposals: in health services especially where the Health Manpower Act, Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act, Partnership for Health Amendments, Community Mental Health Centers Act, Narcotics Control, Migratory Health, and the Public Health Service Act, and Cancer and Heart Control legislation are pending; environmental control; and child development. Notably missing from this list is Federal Civil Service legislation.

The pending manpower and welfare legislation is particularly significant for New Careers and upgrading. President Nixon opened his "Comprehensive Manpower Program" Message to Congress on August 12, 1969 with the words "A job is one rung on the ladder of a lifelong career of work. That is why we must look at manpower training with new eyes; as a continuing process to help people to get started in a job and to get ahead in a career." The proposed O'Hara Manpower Act (H.R. 11620) contains a specific New Careers section as well as general upgrading provisions. The Administration's welfare plan, in addition to the employability features already noted, calls for a very large child care program and turns attention to the working poor. Efforts to include specific New Career language in the House welfare bill did not succeed, but there is still a possibility that such additional language will be added to the final bill.

The legislative base of New Careers is wide and widening. It seems safe to conclude that New Careers concepts are here to stay as a part of our manpower and human service delivery system. It would be incorrect to view Congressional sponsorship of New Careers as some kind of a semantic trick just disguising an old and familiar program in new phraseology. Although New Careers has not been a big controversial issue and the availability of hard evaluative data has been limited, the repeated actions and reports of the House and Senate Labor Committees make the legislative mandate for New Careers very clear. Having followed Congressional action in this area, I venture to suggest that Congress finds New Careers directed to aims it supports through means it finds feasible and desirable. The 1969 House Report on EOA Amendments spells this out.* The Congressional aims: (1) job opportunities for the disadvantaged; (2) help solve professional manpower shortages; and (3) provide better services to the needy. The means to the ends supported by Congressional New Careers legislation: (1) use of the impressive unused productive capacity of the disadvantaged, especially servicing social programs for the poor; (2) by-passing of artificial credentials barriers; (3) realization of the potential of upward mobility on a career ladder; (4) and general support for innovation and change in the vocational preparation and advancement process, in the educational set up, and for "in service" training. There is little room for doubt about Congressional intent when one reads the House Committees admonition in the 1969 Report to the Labor Department not to "permit dilution of the essential program features of New Careers" saying:

> This has occurred in some instances where New Careers has been submerged in the general Concentrated Employment Programs. We urge the Labor Department to remedy this development. There has even been some evidence that new Careers funds have been diverted to non-New Careers general manpower purposes. We consider this to be a completely improper practice.
>
> We are aware of the temptation to diminish the quality of the New Careers demonstration by adapting the cheaper

---

* op. cit., pp. 6-9.

> route of simple entry job creation avoiding the problems of career development. In reaffirming our support of the New Careers program we reemphasize our legislative intent to mandate its full career development content and to this end we urge the Department of Labor to assure that:
>
> 1. The demonstration character of the New Careers program is clearly maintained, with full recognition that such a program with special supportive service and training involves higher costs which must be adequately funded to achieve the program quality provided by this legislation.
>
> 2. The duration of the various New Careers programs and the availability of appropriate New Careers assistance to individual trainees for continued education and training must be extended to permit full development of career potentials.
>
> 3. The guidelines governing the New Careers program are designed to eliminate any possible confusion by clearly stating the distinct status of the New Careers demonstration program. Specifically, the confusion and threat to quality programs resulting from the present CEP and non-CEP division of New Careers should be ended.
>
> 4. Additional New Careers programs are developed to maintain the growth and development of the demonstration effort.
>
> 5. Special emphasis is given to providing released time with pay for support of the training and education essential for career advancement.
>
> We also urge the Labor Department to take steps to assure more adequate program evaluation, to provide the technical assistance required to make the program fully effective, to make the program applicable in nonurban poverty areas, and to take special steps to prepare professionals for the use and development of New Career personnel.*

While this wide and emphatic legislative base has been created for New Careers, actual implementation has been limited. The original Scheuer New Career programs administered by the Department of Labor were first funded in May, 1967, less than three years ago.

---

* Op. Cit., p. 9.

The Department of Labor issued, and then reenforced with revisions, very strong New Careers guidelines. However, it never proved possible to achieve overall effective enforcement of these directives, and much of the very limited New Careers money has been diverted into pseudo-New Careers programs which resulted in numbers of slots and placements lacking the program quality demanded by the law and Departmental guidelines. In many instances, there has been a lack of the necessary commitment to the New Careers program's quality content, skepticism, and even outright opposition to and diversion of the program content and implementation, particularly by many employing agencies. Moreover, less than three years is a very short time to test a program as complicated and challenging as New Careers, and evaluation in this area has left much to be desired. As a result of all these factors, we have failed to create a really adequate demonstration New Careers model and now have to make program and policy, judgments on the basis of spotty and limited pilot program results. Nonetheless, information is now developing to provide an empirical basis for some preliminary judgements about the New Careers effort, its problems and possibilities.

The basic, and I think most important, positive factor demonstrated by New Careers so far, is the great capacity and motivation of the New Careerists themselves. We have not begun to tap our under-utilized human resources with the New Careers program, but we have gotten a glimpse of the potential. This observation applies to both the unemployed and the underemployed and reflects their eagerness and capacity to take advantage of opportunities for work and advancement as well as their capacity to perform valuable services. This positive factor is confirmed by the response of welfare clients to the WIN program, and makes all the more tragic that program's failure to deliver adequate job and career opportunities. Moreover, I think it is established that non-professionals can render meaningful services, both in terms of old services and new added services. A recent example: the thirty community residents trained to provide basic therapeutic services in the Harlem Rehabilitation Center at Harlem Hospital, adding services never provided before with demonstrably favorable results. Such examples can be multiplied many times, and while examples are not proof, the evidence supporting the service potential of New Careers/non-professional workers is overwhelming. Furthermore, although these are serious obstacles, New Careers experience has shown that credentials barriers so well highlighted by Dr.S. M. Miller can be successfully circumvented and it is feasible and fruitful to readjust the structure and logistics of education and training for effective career advancement.

A number of negative observations are indicated. Some of the early advocates and conceptualizers of "New Careers for the Poor" probably failed to realize adequately the complexity, rigidity, and barriers of the established labor market, and exaggerated the prospects and over-simplified the New Careers process. But if some of us want to give them a C grade on this score, it is possible they deserve A for innovation and shaking up our manpower establishment. Perhaps some of us who deserve A's for realizing how intractable the labor market is, might get a C grade for our own limited innovation and advocacy of needed structural change and effective policy alternatives. But then, I don't much believe in grades.

Certainly experience to date has shown that really to break through the credentials, professional, and bureaucratic agency barriers is a very tough, long undertaking. Assuming the goal of New Careers is worth it, we must be thinking of a long, hard struggle to achieve change and to really generalize career opportunities for the secondary/marginal labor force. Finally, as noted at the outset, the New Careers concepts must be generalized for all workers, especially those with low-income,status, and vocational preparation. This presents both problems and promises. It is promising that the unions most involved in the relevant service areas, the hospital, public service, and teachers unions, have played a very constructive role seeking to combine New Career and upgrading in their jurisdictions.

Much of the reported limited results of the New Careers program reflect not the deficiency of the concept, but the failure to implement the program. The program surely needs strong support from government at all levels as well as adequate funding. Particularly it needs jobs and careers at the end of the recruitment and training-education lines.

It would be presumptuous of me to tell this group what research is needed to develop and carry out an effective New Career/Upgrading program. But I can outline some of the research objectives that have been suggested. Some of this research is already well under way. Of course, it is important to realize that some of the problems confronted-perhaps the most important ones -- are not to be dissolved by research but will require strong advocacy both inside and outside the government.

In general, there needs to be a research switch from emphasis on the supply side, the characteristics and alleged deficiencies of workers, the techniques of training and preparation, to emphasis on the demand side of the labor market equation. Have we analyzed the jobs involved in a job creation program of a million or so public service positions as has been so widely recommended? Do we know where and what these jobs would be? How much research backs up the concept of"government as the employer of last -- or first-- resort"? What institutional adjustments would be necessary? Do we have any usable measures of social cost--social benefit analysis applicable to such measures to fill the job gap. Have we analyzed WPA, PWA, and CCC experiences of the 30's, and World War II manpower experience for its current relevance to job creations? We should begin to give as much attention, including building the knowledge and research base to intervention on the job supply side as we have been giving to the labor supply side.

Of course, functional job analysis intimately geared to changing service delivery system goals remains a major research need for development of career ladders and upgrading. Fortunately, through the work of Dr. Sidney Fine and Wretha Wiley at the W.E. Upjohn Institute and the pioneering Health Services Mobility Study directed by Dr. Eleanor Gilpatrick, we are building models for this kind of research. On the basis of this type of research we can restructure jobs, integrate jobs properly to worker qualifications, and create realistic ladders of occupational mobility. This type of analysis should be applied without delay to the main target areas of public service employment, including particularly the newly expanding service areas such as environmental control, child care and development, and family planning. Isn't it true that we lack effective models of service-job function requirements and ladders in these areas? We need to know what entry jobs are suitable for New Careers, and with what variations. We need for all service areas to be able to define clearly the parameters of generic and specific task job preparation. It is necessary to be able to evaluate on-the-job performance and the level of service to delivery. A system of on-going updating for major functional job analysis systems is necessary to adjust to changing technological and service conditions--to make the Fine-Wiley-Gilpatrick work a continuing process and not just excellent one shot contributions.

As New Careers meshes with more general upgrading processes, research is needed to clarify the entire mobility process. We do need to know more about the target population--are there differences between New Careerists and low-income employees in various services areas? Is the secondary/marginal labor force homogeneous, what are the relevant variations within this population? What is the role and effect of supplementary services on employability? How do we link new entries into the career process with the already employed? What is the existing union, employer collective bargaining structure of upgrading? We need to know more about all aspects of existing dead end jobs, the existence and the lack of upward mobility, and factors of motivation. How does the general level of economic activity affect upgrading? How can New Careers and the Public Service Careers programs be made effectively available to youth? How do we integrate these programs with Vocational Education and the in-school programs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

We are beginning to get some light on the realities of just what education levels and capacities the performance of various jobs really requires and to compare these objective realities with hiring standards. A new study by Prof. Ivar Berg of Columbia University is titled Education and Jobs*, its subtitle is "The Great Training Robbery," and it details the excessive educational standards govern-job eligibility. The Department of Labor has funded an excellent study directed by Prof. Daniel E. Diamond of New York University which describes the dysfunctionally excessive hiring standards in ten major entry and near entry level occupations.** Similarly Oscar Ornati,*** Mark A. Haskell****, and J.J. Kirkpatrick*****have illustrated and emphasized the impact of artifically high hiring standards and joined Berg and Diamond in underlining the fact that this condition has been biased against the minority and disadvantaged job seeker. It is too bad that we have had to wait until 1970 for these research results--they would have been helpful five years ago. And it is regrettable that the Dictionary of Occupational Titles so desperately needs this kind of correction. We should not wait longer to complete the research necessary for a completely objective description of job performance requirements in all major work areas so that the artificial credentials barriers can be effectively confronted and New Careers and upgrading can be advanced.

Finally, and all too briefly, two major additional comments: the civil service system needs to be thoroughly researched for upgrading and New Career purposes. We need and emphatically much more carefully planned, more practically relevant demonstration projects with adequate evaluation.

But beyond research, and beyond program details, it must be recognized that a successful New Careers and upgrading program cannot be built under conditions of rising unemployment and austerity in social service programs. Unless funds and policies lead to a very large expansion of job opportunities in public services all efforts of refinement and program improvement will be to little avail.

---

* Berg, Ivar, Education and Jobs, Praeger Publishers, N.Y., 1970

** Diamond, Daniel, Bedrosian, Hroch, Industry Hiring Requirements and the Employment of Disadvantaged Groups, N.Y.U., School of Commerce, 1970.

*** Op. Cit.

**** Op. Cit.

***** Kirkpatrick, James and others, Testing and Fair Employment, New York University Press, N.Y., 1968.

New Careers and the Service Sector

Chairman - Gerald G. Somers

GERALD G. SOMERS: After listening to this morning's session I've concluded we really can't define precisely the meaning of "careers", or "new" or "upgrading" either. However, we have learned many valuable things about these concepts and I trust that this afternoon's session will measure up to the same high standards we have already witnessed in this Conference. Our first speaker is Sidney Fine of The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. He has done considerable work on the interrelations of occupations which is closely associated with today's topic.

UPGRADING: A FRAMEWORK FOR CAREERS

Michael D. Batten and Sidney A. Fine

THE W. E. UPJOHN INSTITUTE

FOR

EMPLOYMENT RESEARCH

PART I

Introduction

This paper is devoted to an attempt at defining the concept of upgrading and the personnel situation to which it relates. It will examine two actual situations and propose some guidelines for the practical application of upgrading to career opportunity systems in public service agencies.

To begin with, the term upgrading is not particularly felicitous in the context of manpower mobility. There are better, more traditional terms that are more explicit. For example: Does it mean upward mobility for the worker? Then in that case, why not use promotion? Does it mean increasing the complexity of the job? Then in that case why not speak of job design or redesign? Does it mean additional training for the worker so that he becomes capable of assuming more difficult or responsible work? Then why not refer to worker or staff development?

These questions are relevant because all three of these contingencies are the reality that exists behind the term upgrading.

This reality has both a worker and an employer aspect. The reality for the worker is that, when he stays in any given job situation, over time he acquires experience which increases his range of skills with both the job content and the ways and styles of the organization. This increase in his skills is typically referred to as his growth on the job. While it is likely that the worker gains a certain amount of personal satisfaction from this, typically this is not enough. He wants additional recognition of his growth in terms of money, status, or other emoluments. If he does not receive this kind of recognition, he is usually dissatisfied and leaves even though the new situation may, on the whole, not be much better.

From the employer's point of view, the more experience the worker obtains and the more he grows, the more productive he is likely to be and the more satisfactory his output. He is also likely to be more dependable. Thus, it would seem to be to the advantage of the employer to make the payoff to the worker in money, status, etc. In our highly mobile labor market it would also appear to be a necessity, if the employer is to keep the work force necessary to meet his contractual obligations.

By and large, this is the process that goes on even in large corporations where jobs are highly specialized and routinized. In such situations, if an employer cannot satisfy the worker with status and more responsibility, he tries to provide him with increments in his base pay and fringe benefits. In the context of this reality, "upgrading" is a personnel management tool to capitalize on workers' growth and employers' need for greater skill and dependability.

Formally, in upgrading (in this case job design) the attempt is made for achieving a particular organizational objective, arrange them in order of difficulty and complexity as represented by the training and experience required to perform them, organize them into appropriate jobs from very simple entry jobs to more complex ones, and realistically integrate the jobs into the production operation. On top of this, the employer imposes some form of job classification and job titles which presumably reflect the hierarchical organization of skills.The job classifications frequently have associated with them job descriptions which presumably integrate the statements of tasks performed. This often presents difficulties since the task statements and job descriptions have a way of getting out of date due to changes in the methods used and the organization of the work process.

Ideally, when upgrading is meeting the needs of both the worker and the employer to the fullest extent, there is an opportunity for every worker to obtain the classification that reflects his growth and for the employer to benefit from the employee's use of his most developed skills. However, a number of conditions interfere with this ideal. One of these is that an organization does not have work opportunities for the maximum development of all worker skills. In other words, the skills required by most work organizations provide for only a limited part of what most workers can offer. Consequently, there are artifical ceilings placed upon how far workers can be "upgraded" (that is, promoted). Secondly, seniority plays as much a part in upgrading as ability. Thus, whereas the workers first on the job may not have the skill potential of workers who come later, they nevertheless block the path of growth for the johnny-come-latelys. Third, some workers are much more able to make a case for their skill growth on the basis of the symbols and artifacts of job descriptions and personal qualifications than others and hence learn to manipulate the upgrading framework (staffing plan) to gain personal advantages in the form of higher wages and status. Fourth, employers also, to gain advantages, will manipulate the upgrading (promotion) system to favor a particular employee or will utilize the acquired skills of workers and delay paying for them on the grounds that there are no vacancies, meaning that the system is unable to accommodate the workers' growth at a particular point in time. Unfortunately, these aberrations of the "upgrading" system are all too common and one purpose this paper hopes to serve is to indicate what may be done to help prevent them, if not eliminate them.

It is particularly important to give attention to the problem of making the various aspects of upgrading work at this time because an intelligent, fairly and effectively applied upgrading system can serve as a framework for careers and as a basis for bringing into the work force disadvantaged and minority group members who have been so effectively kept out of the main stream of the American Labor market. If a plant properly applies itself to the various aspects of upgrading, then it in effect creates openings at the bottom of its system which can be effectively filled by those with relatively little education, training, and experience. Note that we speak of a framework of careers, not merely of jobs. We do this because we accept the fact that it is not enough to provide the disadvantaged with jobs alone because jobs are what they have been given for hundreds of years without meeting their needs for growth and stability. Today, we must provide them with jobs which lead somewhere, which lead upward to better jobs. In other words, the jobs must provide for mobility so that they are stepping stones in careers.

PART II

Two Contrasting Examples

Two public service agencies will illustrate some of the current problems in introducing effective upgrading systems.

There are twenty-one grades in the organizational hierarchy of the United States Post Office. Over 500,000 employees are in Grade 5 or below. Between Grade 6 through 21 there are approximately 100,000 workers; 50,000 of these are in Grades 6 and 7. The reason for the lack of career positions in the upper levels is that the overwhelming amount of work that needs to be done in the Post Office is relatively simple sorting and delivering of mail. The routine and mechanical nature of the work leaves little room for variety and discretion. Because there are comparatively very few positions above Grade 5, the large mass of workers have little possibility for upward mobility in the organization and the organization does not provide upgrading training except for management staff. The result is that the workers with a strong career drive, and those who want more than the money increments resulting from seniority, leave. The workers who remain must try to make as much of their limited jobs as possible, such as exaggerating their skill requirements or their importance, in order to command more remuneration. The turnover is high and deplored, but lived with. Situations such as this resist upgrading in terms of providing opportunities for real growth of skill and in fact lend themselves to automation. This is where the major Post Office efforts are being concentrated. One result may be fewer jobs, but proportionately more opportunities for promoting the worker who remain.

The second example is taken from a state welfare agency. According to traditions and policy, it seems that the worker qualifications needed to carry out much of the agency's case work is a master's degree in social work. There is, however, a shortage of such workers. In trying to cope with the problem for workers with undergraduate degrees, the state subsidizes a two-year off-the-job educational program leading to an MSW. In return, the worker must agree to work in the agency for about two years after receiving his degree. Nevertheless, 50 percent of the new MSW's leave, presumably for better jobs and better conditions after the required time limit. Many go to private agencies, which provide work and pay more suitable for their newly-acquired educational qualifications.

Upgrading here is working for the workers but not for the agency because it has focused its attention on worker qualifications, on the MSW credential, rather than on the work that has to get done.

The work content, the tasks to be performed often do not require the skills of an MSW. Hence the returning MSW is confronted with tasks that are essentially below his new potential. The discretionary content of work turns out to be far below the workers' new abilities. The organization, without a task analysis and exploration of options is not able to redesign the jobs to accommodate the more highly qualified workers. The agency provided for the training of the workers, but its upgrading system did not provide for recognizing, legitimizing, and paying off for their continued growth. In effect it built unwanted turnover into its system and is still in the situation where the work it wants done by highly credentialized people is being done by workers who are less qualified on paper but may be quite adequate from the standpoint of experience. In short, the organization relied on an upgrading device, not the needs of the tasks. Hence its upgrading framework was not oriented to its real needs.

These organizations typify the Scylla and Charybdis of the upgrading problem. Namely, either they do not have the jobs to absorb the potentials of workers in low level classifications or where they do, they set up unrealistic requirements and utilize upgrading practices which prove self-defeating. Many public service agencies are in similar straits. To avoid such traps, these organizations must examine more closely the work which must get done to achieve production, the tasks workers perform to achieve objectives, optional ways of organizing tasks into jobs and what it is that workers want and expect from their jobs. This will permit organizations to recogniz and explore their upgrading needs.

PART III

Six Guidelines for Upgrading and Their Incorporation in Career Growth

Here briefly are six guidelines which are more or less essential requirements if an upgrading system as elaborated upon here is to work, both for the public service agency and its work force.

1. Make an analysis of tasks necessary to achieve an organization's objectives. Do not, of course, rely on existing job descriptions and classifications. The task analysis must incorporate a differentiation of levels of skill on objective bases that define:

   a. Increasing behavioral complexity in the ways that workers relate to Things, Data, (information/ideas) and People.

   b. The changing proportions of discretionary duties as opposed to prescriptive duties which must be reflected in instructions associated with tasks.

   c. Increasing and/or differing General Educational requirements in terms of reasoning, language and mathematical ability.

   d. Increasing and/or differing responsibility and independence requirements in regard to achieving performance standards.

The requirement here is for organizational units (sub-systems) of a public service agency to define their objectives specifically enough so that all the tasks generated implement those objectives. There will be a great variety of tasks, requiring different levels of skill on the part of workers who will perform them. The payoffs for the agency resulting from such a task analysis is that it gives them options in regard to:

--Organizing tasks into jobs (according to different skill levels required, discretionary content, etc.) to get its work done.

--Establishing and legitimizing the grading or classification of jobs on the basis of skill and educational requirements rooted in the tasks.

--Hiring new workers and the actual promotion of present staff.

2. Design jobs to include tasks that are basically homogeneous on a given level of skill, but include sufficient additional tasks on a higher level so that workers are given the opportunity to stretch, grow and test themselves.

This is important for both the worker and the organization. The worker gains a growth opportunity; the organization can observe worker potential. A corollary to the above principle is that some variety of tasks, requiring the exercise of different skills, be included in the job content.

3. Provide in-house training which is task and job relevant on a regular and systematic basis so that the workers' skills are reinforced and he gets the know-how to take on new tasks that stretch his abilities.

This is the most obvious way for an organization to utilize the manpower potential already available to it. However, it must be able to provide the performance standards and the supervision so that the worker has some immediate knowledge of the results of his training. This feedback is essential for his growth.

4. Provide relevant off-the-job education to give the worker the general background necessary to expand his functional capability in dealing with a) discretionary duties of his job and b) the higher level tasks that test his potential.

The reason why this training is best given and best received off the job is because it is geared to the worker's general functional abilities and not tied to specific skills. The individual, in such learning situations, tends to be challenged more as a total person than as a worker. The knowledge, interest, and values he takes from such training are best related to his job's discretionary duties, that is, where the worker exercises his own judgment and develops his own procedures to perform tasks. Community colleges are, of course, excellent resources for this type of education and training.

5. Recognize, legitimize, and pay for growth within the framework of the organization, even if the increments are relatively small.

What this really does is commit an agency to its own job classifications, job descriptions, etc. Are they used to get productivity from the worker without payoff? Or are they used, adapted to,and built on the actual tasks a worker performs? Such a policy, of course, is vital to an agency which employs disadvantaged workers. These workers are especially sensitive to non-remunerated exploitation of developed skills.

6. Help a worker to find a better job when he has outgrown the possibilities of his present job and organization.

This guideline is essential for organizations caught in a Post Office type bind. It is also the real product of an upgrading system. If a limit exists to growth, then an organization should face that constraint and turn the liability into an asset. Upgrading for workers who reach such limits is "outgrading," that is, transfer. It is for this reason particularly that every public service agency should maintain cooperative relations with other agencies.

PART IV

Consequences of an Effective Upgrading Program

There are several consequences to be faced in carrying out an upgrading program characterized by the guidelines proposed. We will state them as they relate particularly to a public service agency.

1. Acceptance of Turnover

Turnover is not the evil it seems if the turnover is regarded positively. It is indeed a cost, but it may be that the cost of dealing with it positively is no more than the cost of fighting it. This can certainly be true in the public service agencies. The apparent disruption of function due to turnover can be offset by instituting a career opportunity system and using it in part as a back-up device for the personnel system. It is elementary that support for personal growth is a powerful morale builder and spur to maximum production.

2. Accept Flexibility

The flexibility we speak of relates to classifications, titles, supervision, seniority, promotion for merit, and provision of training. This is one of the most difficult things for a public service system to accept on a formal basis, although informally personnel are constantly maneuvering to circumvent its rigidities. Apparently one reason the public service trends toward rigidification is to equalize everything and thereby eleiminate conflict. However, it is high time that we accept conflict as a fact of life and develop strategies to deal with it as Kenneth Boulding has suggested in the March, 1970, issue of Trans-Action--"We ought to be able to train people to feel that a well-managed conflict is a beautiful thing and should not be suppressed. On the other hand, a badly-managed conflict can be disastrous for all parties."

The thrust for upgrading tends to reval the inherent basic conflict between worker and management goals; this however, is less in public service agencies than in private industry. However there is also inherent mutual need and complementarity. Thus, there exists a real basis for a well-managed conflict--not necessarily the mess that is breaking in the headlines today.

3. Acceptance by the Public Service Agency of Role as Employer of First Opportunity

The broadest purpose of the government service agency is to serve the public. In a wider sense it serves the public by providing employment, training, and opportunity for advancement to its own personnel. When the government provides employment to members of a minority group or the economically disadvantaged, it is providing them with an opportunity they might not be able to get elsewhere. If it has an effective upgrading system it also is giving them the opportunity to learn and work at the same time--an approach that is by all odds the best and most economical. By so serving these persons, the agency becomes an employer of first opportunity. The new workers, by their job productivity and by their own development as persons, serve the total public; they, of course, also become taxpayers.

This is completely opposed to the notion of government as the employer of last resort. This latter point of view seems self-defeating because of an implicit assumption that whoever is employed by the government as a last resort can't make it by any other means. How do we know if no other means have been offered?

4. Acceptance of Workers as People as well as Human Resources

There is something quite obnoxious in the term "human resource." It smacks of the worst aspects of Taylorism which tended to look at people as instruments, as machines. Presumably we've graduated from this point of view. If we looked at workers primarily as people and attempted to understand the importance and vitality of their needs as well as those of the work organization, then it is likely that we could see the work organization also as an educational institution. This would be an important step forward because we could then see the public service agency in a more realistic light, namely as an educational and training institution for all the people as well as a work organization.

GERALD G. SOMERS: Our next speaker will perhaps elaborate on an earlier comment made today that the civil service has tended to lag behind some of the other sectors in meeting the problems of upgrading and New Careers. Jean Couturier will discuss "Accommodating Merit Systems to Upgrading." Jean is with the National Civil Service League.

Accommodating Merit Systems to Upgrading

by

Jean Couturier

Today I would like to tell you what I see is happening in the public sector--in the civil services across the nation exclusive of the federal civil service--and what I think the implications of this are for public policy in the next five or ten years.

Governments at all levels today employ 17 percent of the work force and spend $100 billion on direct payrolls. Demands for public services are such that one out of every four new jobs in the United States is in the public sector. Between October 1967 and October 1968, the number of civilian employees in state and local government grew from 8.9 to 9.4 million. Few of these 1/2 million jobs went to the disadvantaged. Simultaneously, at least three million people in the country earned incomes below the poverty threshold, even though they worked full-time.

It is conservatively estimated that of the 500,000 new jobs to be created each year in state and local government, a minimum of 100,000 could go to the poor, if existing barriers were removed. Another 100,000 job vacancies could also be claimed for the disadvantaged, well-motivated worker through positive changes in existing systems. Government turnover and job vacancy rates are estimated to provide 1,000,000 job openings at any given time.

The National Civil Service League looked at these facts and decided that our public service faces a crisis of great magnitude--and one on which we should act. Thus, the League has turned its attention to two areas of national concern: the growing shortage of personnel for government jobs, and the need of the disadvantaged for meaningful, "real" jobs. The League believes that each of these problems carries the other's solution. Yet civil service systems often seem to frustrate the hiring of would-be employees.

The League believes that rules and regulations designed to facilitate the merit system in the 1890's or the 1930's do not necessarily serve the 1970's. Further, the League knows that many jurisdictions around the country--state, county and city--want to revise their personnel structures to fit today. But how, and in what direction?

It is to provide leadership relevant to this age that the League developed a new project: Public Employment and the Disadvantaged. The League is working with public and private leaders in cities, counties and states to help bring the disadvantaged into public employ under merit principles.

Our method has been to assemble data, survey the field, examine the "state of the art" in public personnel management, develop a new edition of the League's famed Model Civil Service Law (earlier versions of which formed the basis of the Federal Civil Service and nearly every other civil service in the nation). We have conducted and spoken before local, regional and national workshops and have offered policy guidance and technical assistance to some thirty jurisdictions.

These programs have been conducted under a joint grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity and the U. S. Department of Labor and a contract with the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We are continuing our work in this field: for example, we have just agreed to a further technical assistance program under the aegis of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In addition to the technical assistance and policy guidance given across the nation, we have met with, interviewed and developed data from literally thousands of public personnel officials, from representatives of the poor, and from both private and public agencies dealing with the employment problems of the disadvantaged. While our studies are not yet completed, we have published some materials and will shortly be publishing more.

The League, in conceiving and promoting the merit principle has held to the two concepts that give it meaning: one--equal treatment of all who would enter the credentialed civil service; and two--provision of some form of employee protection to prevent spoils practices.

We know there are five key elements to good personnel management systems. Job definition, or structure; job specifications, or requirements; recruitment or outreach; selection, or examination; and training, or development. Our studies and technical assistance efforts have shown us that, if each of these is approached intelligently and with good will, jobs will be opened up for the "locked out" disadvantaged and merit systems will be stronger.

One significant part of our work--which is being prepared now--deals with case studies of a great number of jurisdictions. These are studies of public services that have tried to meet the dual problems of jobs for the disadvantaged and improved staffing for government programs. It is very clear from these studies that a great deal can be done--and quickly.

In almost no instances has there been a need to change an existing civil service law. Rather, the need has been to change archaic practices that create rigidities and demean the merit principle. This usually requires little more than a willingness to examine past practices and change those that are irrelevant or in contradiction of true merit. Sometimes it requires policy changes. Occasionally rules or regulations need to be changed. But that is about it. An important conclusion is that a systems approach to change and modernizing public personnel management is needed and will enhance the quality of the public service.

Here are some of our findings:

*Restructuring jobs in a large jurisdiction (as they did in New Jersey) will create thousands of job openings.

*Removing unrealistic education or experience requirements (as in one city that required a dog catcher to have two years experience--as a dog catcher) will not only open jobs for the poor, but will rid the jurisdiction of many "depression born irrelevances."

*One state requires at least an eighth grade education and one year's experience in a commercial laundry for a beginning laundry worker ($3,600 a year); the same jurisdiction requires a high school education and five years experience in a commercial laundry ($6,500 a year) for a laundry section supervisor.

*Recruiting via the ghetto will find that the educational level there is about the average of the nation, but that the people living there don't know where the jobs are.

*Performance examinations are more meaningful in many cases than written exams (most truck driver candidates, as well as PhD candidates and the disadvantaged, fear and resent exams which test little more than their ability to take tests).

*One city gives a written exam for a washroom attendant, and the applicant must pay a fee of $3.00 to take the exam. In a recent examination, it took six months to grade the exam and notify those who passed. The job pays $3,600 a year.

*Training--pre and post employment--is crucial to job success in any case, and we have found many jurisdictions which see the reasonableness of giving a trainee who has satisfactorily completed his training a credentialed job.

Efforts to improve recruitment techniques have taken a number of forms. The Civil Service Commission of the State of New Jersey, for example, has asked local Community Action Agencies, minority group organizations working with the disadvantaged,to refer possible candidates. A unique feature of this program is the effort to encourage prisoners to take examinations for some positions--after which the prisoners are placed on certification lists, according to their ratings.

The State of Connecticut has set up branch offices in inner-city areas, at which job applicants are counseled and assisted in filling out applications; when necessary, they are accompanied to agencies where vacancies exist. Affirmative action programs to recruit more minority employees are also underway in other states and cities.

Several state and local governments have initiated programs to develop realistic and appropriate testing procedures for entry and low-level jobs. In New Jersey and Connecticut, tests for training or entry-level jobs attempt to measure aptitude, not acquired skill. In New York City, applicants for certain jobs in poverty programs who pass the regular tests with a given score receive additional credit if they live in a poverty area, have a low income, or are older workers. This addition to their test scores helps to bring the poor and disadvantaged into the programs. A number of other cities and states are experimenting with new testing procedures, all aimed at opening jobs to the disadvantaged.

Training programs to prepare the disadvantaged for civil service positions have, in some instances, involved the creation of trainee or aide positions, from which movement into higher level work is expected. Programs of this and other types aimed at training the disadvantaged are underway in Connecticut, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Los Angeles County has an ongoing program in its hospital for training clerical workers and hospital attendants. Seattle has an active training program for entry-level clerical and maintenance jobs, which includes both in-service training and outside formal education provided by the city.

Revision of requirements for entry jobs has probably been the most widespread approach to increasing opportunities for minority group members in state and local governments. Specific educational requirements have been eliminated in a number of instances. For example, in New Jersey the requirement of an eighth-grade education for unskilled positions has been eliminated in the career development program; all that is now required is the ability to read, write, and understand English sufficiently to follow instructions. The requirement of high school graduation for certain positions has been removed in Pittsburgh and other cities. The

State of Pennsylvania has revised its employment practices with regard to arrest records and convictions.

Job restructuring to create entry-level positions and career ladders is underway in a number of state and local jurisdictions. In California, for example, subprofessional jobs are being created in a variety of occupational fields. In the State of Washington, the caseworker job series has been restructured, as have those of parole officer and employment service interviewer. Other cities and states are similarly experimenting with job redesign.

The number of jobs for minority group members thus created by state and local governments does not yet approach the need. But these government actions are welcome evidence that the problem of equal opportunity in public employment is receiving attention not accorded to it in the past--a matter of importance from two points of view: state and local governments are a very large and rapidly growing field of employment, offering the possibility of positions with career potential for large numbers of minority group members. At the same time, recruitment of workers from these groups can help to meet the personnel shortages which now impede the provision of adequate public services in many fields.

These are some of the things we have been able to establish and which we will be publishing soon. One other thing we have found is that many jurisdictions really want to move into the last third of the twentieth century with viable and effective manpower systems but they lack two needed stimuli:

*One is encouragement and stimulation brought about by specific mandates in federal programs and by programs of help and advice such as the League has been undertaking.

*The second is the money and resources to implement change.

These latter are minimal, because they are essentially support services, but a small investment can have a tremendous payout. The former, handled well, will create more jobs in the next five years than can most non-government programs. This, only because it is government that will provide the new jobs--and in the millions.

NATIONAL POLICY IMPLICATIONS

For any insights we might have at this point on how federal law and programs might embody some of the principles we have learned, I am happy to submit the following for consideration:

1. In all federal grant-in-aid programs there ought to be specific, hard language both (a) barring discrimination at all job levels by any state or local recipient of grants-in-aid and (b) providing enforcement machinery at the federal level with requirements for reports.

These programs should carry the mandatory penalty of funds cutoff for violations and should establish a clear system of enforcement, with criteria.

One reason for so advising is that, though the civil services of our nation have, by and large, discriminated much less than has the private sector, they still do discriminate (see the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1969 report "For All the People, By All the People"). Such studies as we have seen (and our own observations) lead us to conclude that a mere "statistical reporting" is insufficient as is mere reliance on current grant-in-aid language. Analysis indicates that many "affirmative action" programs end up with minorities predominatly in the lower level, more menial jobs.

An important device springs from the federal contracts concept used in the Labor Department's Equal Employment Opportunity program. This would stipulate that, before any examination be promulgated (written, oral unassembled, performance, interview) it must be positively shown to be, and certified as, specifically relevant to the position for which the test is being given.

2. Specific funds should be made available for programs concerned with public employment of the disadvantaged. These would usually be within and occasionally outside the merit systems. Some examples follow:

A. Funds to recognize job-related social realities--for example:

   1. Day care for children of working mothers in the public sector; transportation assistance; supportive counseling; health needs.

   2. Short range subsidies to public employers who initiate compensatory preferential hiring (as in veteran preference, for example) for disadvantaged persons outside the regular merit system until such time as the persons employed are fully qualified under standard criteria.

B. Specific training money for programs of public employment of the disadvantaged. We have found some of the most critical needs to be funds for:

   1. Training the disadvantaged individual, both on a pre-employment basis and on a post employment ("Hire now, train later") basis;

   2. Upgrading incumbent staff, particularly at the lower levels among whom are many from disadvantaged backgrounds and who are frustrated in moving up or who see others coming as threats;

   3. Supervisory training on working with disadvantaged individuals, such training to be beyond "sensitivity training" and to get at how the supervisor and others can train, work with, supervise and develop those in need.

   4. Earmarked funds for vocational education for the public service at high school and junior high levels.

C. Funds for special, sustained, outreach recruiting efforts.

Traditional Post Office, City Hall, regular newspaper and specialized (e.g., college) recruiting efforts are badly in need of modernization. Our studies show clearly that those in the "ghetto" are not being reached; that employers tend to reserve marginal jobs for ghetto residents but that qualified persons are there--usually underemployed rather than unemployed--who are not being reached by traditional methods.

D. Direct special technical assistance and policy guidance funds on pilot bases or broadly for national efforts and for state-local jurisdictions that are prepared to take a systems approach to career (credentialed positions within the system that can lead to further career development) employment for the disadvantaged by updating and making employment systems fully relevant.

E. Funds to make studies on, and conduct experiments in validation of employment practices (exams, job descriptions, etc.) on such a scale that true validation techniques can be applied, analyzed and evaluated. This envisages research in the literature, examination of what has been done, and establishing specific experiments (e.g., employing and following work of two groups of persons in sufficiently similar situations, but with one group taking the standard test while the other doesn't).

F. Funding broad national research, data gathering and information dissemination efforts on public personnel management changes and developments. This envisages reports, conferences, newsletters, etc.

In summary we are convinced that the whole area of job descriptions, specifications, recruitment, selection and training in the public sector needs a thorough revision for creating meaningful career opportunities for the disadvantaged within the merit systems generally. And, both money and incentive from the national government are needed.

We are convinced of two things: there is a need to create, communicate, and effect a civil service reform agenda that will be meaningful for the last third of the twenthieth century; and the pressures of intergovernmental relations development, the advent of collective bargaining in the public service, the problems of the needy disadvantaged to find careers in staff-starved governments, have generated a true "crisis of competence" in our public services.

Governments--federal, state and local--have an opportunity to meet part of this crisis by being the employer of the first resort to create real careers for the disadvantaged and meet desperate staffing needs.

GERALD G. SOMERS: Thank you,Jean. We'll now turn to Sumner Rosen. Sumner has a long and distinguished career with unions and is now associated with the Institute for Public Administration.

Upgrading and New Careers in Health

Sumner M. Rosen

Preface

In principle the health industry provides an excellent setting for extensive and integrated development of both upgrading systems and new vocational roles. Very large numbers of people are employed at all levels, from the most highly trained to casual labor requiring virtually no skill preparation of education. Many more will be in the years ahead. Many health-related activities are carried out in large institutional settings such as hospitals, with long training and educational traditions. The need for more skilled health manpower is already acute and is expected to become still more marked in the future; upgrading existing personnel is clearly an appropriate methods for dealing with this problem, and would be cheaper as well as quicker than undertaking to train new workers for these jobs. Deficiencies in the provision of needed health services point to the need for new kinds of vocational roles, as well as increasing the numbers in existing health-related work. These new roles can readily be integrated with existing ones in a comprehensive system for developing career opportunities.

In practice the obstacles are formidable. There is no tradition in the health occupations or professions for moving trained people upward to higher levels of skill and responsibility. Licensure is endemic, and closely circumscribes the set of tasks which each distinct occupational group is permitted to perform. There are few economic incentives at work which would induce managers within the industry to seek more rational use of manpower through better integration of tasks and jobs; indeed management is perhaps the least developed profession within the health industry.

Health is probably the most hierarchic of any industry, with the possible exception of the military and the church. Routes to particular occupations are carefully prescribed and circumscribed; jobs and tasks within the family of occupations are often specified in detail, and deviations beyond the specified limits subject to discipline; concern with relative status of each special group and sub-group is a prominent feature of the sociological landscape where health care is provided, and a matter of constant preoccupation to those at each status level. Each level defends its status vis-a-vis those below; each seeks to enhance its status through group action. "Professional" is the key to status, and professionalism is the pride of those who have it, the envy of those who do not.

Licensure is one of the keys to professional status. It has unaccountably been neglected in manpower literature. In health, license is controlled by the individual states. [1] Twenty-five health occupations are now licensed, eleven-including doctors, registered nurses, practical nurses, and pharmacists-in all states, and physical therapists in all but one. There are 799 separate state licensing bodies; 432 of these are autonomous and consist wholly or predominantly of members of the profession itself, or of one which stands above it in the hierarchy. Many licensing statutes require not simply evidence of competence, usually through a written examination, but evidence of completion of training at an accredited institution as a condition of taking the examination. Thus the route to a licensed occupation is closely circumscribed and alternative routes, such as training abroad, foreclosed. These measures, justified historically to protect the public against unqualified practitioners, are likely to be used to protect or enhance the status and the economic interests of those who enjoy their protection. Nor does once-in-a-lifetime licensure provide the protection for the public which is its principal justification. Particularly troubling about licensure is the absence from the licensing process of representation of the "public interest," whether through lay commissioners or impartial experts.

Pressures for Change

We have choices to make about the future of manpower in health which were not as clear in the past. Increasing public awareness of the qualitative as well as the quantitative failures of the present system have provided a basis of support for significant changes. The problem of professional shortages is seen as reaching crisis proportions. The spectacle of competent products of the medical arms of the military returning to civil life and denied the opportunity to put their military training and skills to work has placed the traditional systems of education in health occupations increasingly on the defensive. The growing share of public funds in the total national bill for health services inevitably brings with it increasing demands that the supply system which uses these funds accept and respond to public scrutiny of its effectiveness. Spokesmen for racial minorities include the medical system, along with public education and other services, in their list of failures which victimize the residents of the ghetto and the members of racial minorities, and there is substantial justice to their charge. Hospital workers have begun to organize into unions, beginning in New York and now spreading to other cities. These new unions include in their demands, beside the traditional trade union concerns with wages, hours, benefits, and working conditions, the demand that their members be provided with access to training, education and upgrading opportunities. But the wage pressures themselves must lead to more rational use of labor categories which were never taken seriously in the past, since aides and orderlies are numerically so important in hospitals.

---

[1] "State Licensing of Health Occupations," Department of Health, Education and Welfare, October, 1967.

The latter development has the added feature that the hospital workers, particularly in cities, are now predominantly members of racial minorities and thus share a concern with health care which is expressed within the community from which they come. It is striking how much approval and support the upgrading programs which the hospital unions in New York have pushed attracted from the ghetto community; it was an important factor in laying the basis for cooperation on health issues outside the manpower field between union and community groups, and these links will grow stronger. Health is a major growth industry and the legitimate focus of expectations among minority group members that it will provide significant employment opportunities to them in the future.

Results to Date

What have these pressures, joined to the needs which exist, achieved so far? Primarily, a set of suggestive experiments, which have yet to be institutionalized, a few cases of larger-scale change, and a set of studies whose fruits should prove valuable as the scope for effective change widens in the future.

The experiments largely deal with developing new sub-specialities and recruiting and training candidates for less than the fully professional range of tasks. Toward the top of the hierarchy in this category are the various programs for the training of physicians' and pediatricians' assistants. Dental assistants have also been developed, both in Australia and in the United States; here the best-known program was done at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center. New York University has begun a program to train aides working in physical therapy as Physical Therapy Assistants, a newly recognized category. Occupational Therapy Assistants were trained in New York. In San Francisco Home Health Aides were recruited from low-income neighborhoods and trained to perform many of the tasks traditionally assigned to public health nurses. 2/

2/ Wall Street Journal, April 23, 1970; San Francisco Home Health Service," "Home Health Services and Public Health: Final Demonstration Project Report," February, 1969; P.E. Hammons and H. C. Jamison, "Expanded Functions for Dental Auxiliaries," JADA, vol. 75, September, 1967, pp. 658-672.

The development of comprehensive community health centers, first under the sponsorship of the Office of Economic Opportunity and later by the Public Health Service, has led to widespread innovation in the use of both professionals and non-professionals in health care delivery. These centers are organized to fill gaps which conventional services fail to meet, and often place a high priority on experiment and innovation in the use of personnel, particularly those at the lower level who live in the community being served, and who look to the center not only for a job but for opportunity. New combinations of traditional health occupations-elements of public health nursing, social work, and doctor's assistant, are a frequent and popular combination-are mixed with strong doses of community organizing and patient advocacy in many of these centers. To develop new roles which can be effectively filled by persons with limited formal education has not been difficult; the difficulties arise in attempting to link these new roles to existing health occupations in the larger systems which employ the bulk of health workers, where all of the institutional obstacles referred to earlier present formidable barriers. So far there have been few breakthroughs. 3/

More significant results are found in New York, where the two major unions of lower level hospital workers have made upgrading an important demand, which has begun to receive recognition in collective agreements. Beginning in July, 1969, one percent of payrolls has been paid by the League of Voluntary Hospitals into a fund for training and upgrading established in the League's 1968 agreement with Local 1199, RWDSU. In 1970 the first training programs under this agreement were begun. The fund employs a full-time training staff and uses professional training facilities as well as institutions of higher learning in the New York area to conduct its programs.

This agreement in turn owes much to the example which was set by the Nurses' Aides Upgrading Program which operated in the New York municipal hospital system between 1967 and 1969. This experimental program in upgrading nurses' aides to the level of licensed practical nurse was supported by the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. It was proposed and largely designed by District

---

3/ National Committee on Employment of Youth," Where Do We Go From Here? A Study of the Roads and Roadblocks to Career Mobility for Paraprofessionals Working in Human Service Agencies," December, 1969; Stella Zahn, "New Careers and Health Care Organization", Comprehensive Health Services Career Development Technical Assistance Bulletin, vol. 1, number 5, March, 1970, pp. 5-6, Washington, D.C., University Research Corporation.

Council 37, AFSCME, in the wake of that union's successful effort to organize the aides in 1965. It enrolled 463 aides and graduated 422, 91 percent. Only 3.7 percent were academic failures; the others who left the program did so for personal reasons or because they left the system. It had two unique features:

First, it provided a full training curriculum on a part-time basis, so that all the trainees continued to work as aides during the fourteen-month training period (extended from the normal twelve months to permit work and training to co-exist). Secondly, it enrolled 92 aides who were chosen despite poor educational records and test scores, and who received supplementary remediation before and during their training. Of this group 75, or 82 percent, successfully completed training.

This program required an adaptation of curriculum and teaching methods to fit it to the needs of working adults who all had considerable experience as health workers but who had never been able to take advanced training of any kind. When it was proposed as an experiment to test upgrading as a strategy for resolving problems of professional shortages and for improving the morale of aides, managers and nursing supervisors in the system were highly skeptical; they doubted the ability and motivation of the aides, and they resented the intrusion of the union into the area of their prerogatives.

The success of the program is due primarily to the direct connection which it established between success in training and a concrete reward for success in the form of a guaranteed position as a licensed practical nurse. It suggests that conventional theories of worker motivation, which concentrate on sociological or psychological factors in the worker's life or personality rather than on the incentives which the work situation itself provides, need rethinking. The program encouraged the city to establish an upgrading program from LPN to registered nurse, which is now under way and which represents in principle the establishment of a career ladder in nursing within this large hospital system.

Such programs are difficult to establish. A major reason is that they are costly, particularly for the wages paid to workers who are released for training and education. They are difficult to do well because professional training schools are reluctant to change their ways, and often share the skepticism which the authors of this program found about the ability and motivation of low-level health workers. As they develop, these problems will yield to pressure for their resolution. It will be necessary to go further, to devise methods of testing proficiency which enable the experienced worker to shorten the prescribed training time, to develop curricula and teaching methods adapted to the adult worker, to provide supportive services which overcome the resistance to a return to schooling and help workers to solve family problems which work plus training intensifies, and to integrate training programs with progress on the job so that each meaningful increment of skill and knowledge receives recognition and reward.

These are modest beginnings. They suggest that systematic restructuring of the occupational structure in health would open major new avenues for the application of the upgrading principle. Such restructuring is now the subject of study in several places. Three major strategies can be discerned:

1. Reorganizing utilization within the existing system

This approach is best exemplified by the Health Services Mobility Study. 4/ It conducts a careful and elaborate job task analysis of existing hospital functions, regroups them by levels of skill and training required, identifies jobs and job families, elaborates promotional ladders by broad job category, and designs training programs to enable workers to move from step to step up these ladders. Its parent discipline is industrial engineering, adapted to the nature of work in hospitals. It does not deal with issues of licensure, though they are implicitly subject to scrutiny and possible modification. It accepts the scope and present design of the modern hospital, though it can probably be adapted to changes which the future may bring. Its primary goal and focus is on upgrading within present occupational categories, though it seeks to broaden and integrate sub-categories. It does not design new jobs or new roles for the system to perform.

2. "Systems Analysis" of health and hospital services

Work now going on at the Upjohn Institute 5/ attempts to look at health services as a system, and at manpower needs and utilization in their relationship to the pursuit of the system's goals. It makes only minimal assumptions about the inadequacy of present goals or the present system of manpower utilization and training. Using functional task analysis, this approach reconstructs

---

4/ Health Services Mobility Study, "Plan of Work," 1968, "A Pre-Test Manual for Task Identification," November, 1968, Research Foundation, City University of New York.

5/ W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, "A Systems Approach to New Careers: Two Papers, "Methods for Manpower Analysis, No. 3, November, 1969.

the entire manpower system to fit the goals which the system seeks to achieve. It then proceeds as does the first approach, with the elaboration of job descriptions, identification of job families, construction of career ladders, and the design of training programs.

3. A Model Health Careers Institute

The studies conducted at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine incorporated elements of both approaches outlined above, but took a different point of departure. They envisioned the utilization of an existing hospital, with a rich network of community services, and a major medical school, working together, to construct a working model of a health careers development system which would offer a fully integrated career program. 6/ Such a program seeks to work out in concrete operation all the difficulties which would be encountered and, as this proceeds, to persuade the larger system to recognize and adopt its achievements. It reaches for sweeping changes in the health and its related manpower systems.

All three approaches recognize that the present system of manpower utilization in health is inefficient and ineffective; all three place special stress on the undeveloped role which should be played in the future by the lower levels of hospital and health worker, and thus are committed to the principle of human development using the career ladder approach. All see the bulk of workers at the aide and orderly level as a major resource in the solution to the manpower problems faced by the health industry. All recognize that there are deep-seated irrationalities in the present system, a finding richly documented in the study by Horowitz and Goldstein on hospitals in the Boston area. 7/ To varying degrees they recognize that the problem includes the development of new roles and tasks.8/

6/
Tom Levin and Tanya Russell, "Transitional Report," Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Lincoln Hospital-Health Careers Program," April 1, 1968.

7/
In their study of nonprofessional positions in hospitals, Horowitz and Goldstein found overlaps between jobs with sharply different hiring standards, many dead-end jobs, over emphasis on licensure, fragmentation of job titles and descriptions between institutions with substantially equivalent jobs and employees, underuse of aides by professionals, excessive use of professional time for low-level tasks, and of non-professional time for higher-level tasks. The case for rationalization could hardly be more strongly made; cf. Morris A. Horowitz and Harold M Goldstein, "Hiring Standards for Paramedical Manpower," A Report to the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, September, 1968.

8/
See Edith F. Lynton, "New Careers Potentials in Health: In the Hospital, Beyond the Hospital," New Careers Development Center, New York University, 1968.

New Careers and Health

"New Careers" represents an approach to manpower problems which can fit each of the approaches discussed above, though each case means a different operating framework and emphasis. The ideas associated with new careers originally dealt with techniques for increasing the employment prospects in human service industries of those with limited formal education and skill training. The elements of a new careers "system" in this context include the following:

a. Entry-level positions which are productive and satisfying;

b. Hiring first, with training built in and integrated with work;

c. Visible and accessible career ladders;

d. Training and education on released time;

e. Provision of formal education leading to professional credentials;

f. Joint training of professionals and new careerists to build collegiality;

g. Provision of supportive services to enable non-credentialled workers to achieve the transition, in work and in school.

Each of these elements is difficult to achieve; securing all of them together in a single employment system is far more difficult. That is why it is accurate to say that only elements of the system can presently be found and a complete system is yet to be created. The value of new careers as a manpower strategy cannot yet be evaluated on the basis of concrete experience; that is one source of controversy about it, which only time can deal with. Disputes between proponents and critics cannot now be resolved.

Theorists of new careers have stressed the value of using "new careerists" to extend and improve the services provided by health, education and other systems. Programs already in operation or completed have shown that new careerists can effectively help members of low-income communities to use services more fully and more effectively than before. In the process they have shown that such people can be trained relatively quickly to perform service functions which have either been traditionally performed by credentialled professionals or, in their absence, not at all.

This process, and the relationships which develop among new careerists, professionals and clients have important effects on all the participants. The new careerist acquires insight into both the strengths and the limitations of the professional's relationship to clients and to the work to be done. The worker may experience the satisfaction of improving the performance of the system which employs him, but find professionals defensive about the source of improvement, and reluctant to recognize the new careerist's contribution; professionals express this in different ways, such as withholding knowledge about clients, making decisions without consulting or informing the new careerist, or failing to acknowledge the new careerist's contribution and value. If professionals see new careerists as subverting their prestige and power, they will not deal with them as colleagues, will not provide needed training, will not support changes in institutional arrangements which would enable the new careerist to secure added education and move toward the acquisition of necessary credentials for further career progress.

The resolution of these potential conflicts has important effects. If the hospital or clinic, and the professionals within it, accept the usefulness of the new careerist and open opportunities for career development, staff support of the institution and belief in its good faith will be strengthened; new careerists will be able to see the system as holding significant promise for them. But the new careerist will always be under pressure to work as an advocate for the patient and the community; this is part of his very role and justification. This makes him less fully committed to the institution which employs him than are the professionals with whom he works, and subjects their relationship to inevitable strain. To the degree that these institutions fail to meet the demands made on them, the new careerist will be prone to see the failure as a reflection of professional shortcomings. Armed with knowledge derived from close working relationships with professionals, the new careerist provides added ammunition to those who mount critical attacks on the privileges prerogatives and power of professionals in human service systems; some of the results of such attacks have already been seen in the struggle over control of public schools in New York, and have begun to be expressed about health services with increasing emphasis.

This growing self-awareness among new careerists and low-income workers can alter the internal climate as well as the external relationships of these systems, when management is sympathetic and sensitive, as well as when these attributes are absent. Even when the professionals and system managers support new careers principles, the course of events may well be swift, disturbing and ultimately destructive; the events in 1968 at the Topeka, Kansas, State Hospital and in 1969 at the Lincoln Hospital Mental Health Service in New York were different in origins, but strikingly similar in their impact.[9]

The more effective any experiment with new careers is, the more critical those directly involved in it are likely to become of traditional manpower and training arrangements. As new careers moves from a small-scale experimental program to include significant numbers of workers in major cities, these critical attitudes will receive increasingly coherent expression. Defects in patterns of manpower use and development are particularly vulnerable if they are seen to be linked to defects in the provision of needed health services. If, for example, credential requirements and long educational routes to the acquisition of credentials contribute to manpower shortages, and services suffer for lack of trained manpower while those who wish to work see themselves denied the opportunity because the conventional means for acquiring credentials are not available to them, these requirements will be subject to critical analysis. The burden of proof for the maintenance of the existing system shifts to those who defend it, arrayed against an increasingly critical alliance of consumers and advocates, new careerists, and innovative professionals who doubt the system's efficacy.

Comparisons with the system for training health technicians used by the military show dramatically shorter periods of training required and, for special reasons, virtually total independence of reliance on professional credentials below the level of the physician. Training in the Navy, for example, consists of a basic sixteen week course for corpsmen, advanced training of twenty weeks, plus specialized training in thirty specialties which ranges in length from seven to 60 weeks. The 36 week sequence equips a man to function independently of a medical officer aboard ship or in other situations, for a wide range of medical needs. In ten advanced specialities the training is sixteen weeks or less, and in another six it ranges from eleven to 24 weeks. In the face of these achievements, prolonged and segmented training sequences for civilian health occupations is increasingly difficult to justify, particularly when there are very few cases in which basic training in a special area receives any recognition when one wishes to move to a more advanced level.

The new careerist's work style and close identification with client-patients leads to a further critique based on limitations in the professional approach to providing patients with personalized care, treating them with dignity and respect, assuring adequate follow-up on diagnostic and therapeutic findings, providing continuity of care for individuals and families, and in other ways removing the stigma of charity medicine and professional indifference which predominates in the medical institutions which serve inner city residents and which has been richly documented. A major justification for the comprehensive health centers which have been developed by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Public Health Service has been the need to provide an alternative model to that which prevails and which is seen as short-changing and victimizing ghetto residents. These experiments have provided some evidence that the alternative can be developed; even more important, they have shown that new ways to use and train individuals who do not bring substantial academic or skill preparation to the job can quickly yield good results, and play a major role in the success of these efforts. And the perception of the possibility of a new relationship and collaboration between professional and new careerists deepens and quickens the critique of the traditional approach.

---

[9] Alex Efthim, "We Care in Kansas: The Nonprofessionals Revolt," The Nation, August 5, 1968; Alan Gartner and Ralph Acosta, "Lincoln Hospital Mental Health Services: The Politics of Mental Health," New Careers Development Center, New York University, 1969.

The recent discussion which has begun to arise around issues of professionalism and professional practice involves the idea of accountability; the notion is slowly taking hold that in the new era of public funding of health services, those who depend on them and who share in the cost are entitled to know how well public funds have been spent and how effectively those who hold a public trust have discharged it. The traditional basis of professional accountability--to one's professional peers and colleagues--may be shifting toward one of shared accountability, to the community served as well as to those who traditionally performed this function. There is an important difference between the specter of the layman seeking to dictate how a professional performs his duties, and the prospect that professional decisions and their consequences are properly accountable to those whose health and lives may depend on them. The latter is a political principle long applied in major areas of public life; if, as Clemenceau thought, war is too important to be left to the generals, it may follow that health, like education, is too important to be left to the doctors without the active participation of citizen-consumers. While the idea needs development and precision in its applicability, it can be said with some confidence that the new careerist is likely to lend support to it, as well as to play a role in its ultimate implementation. Indeed one can go a step further; if accountability cannot readily be secured or effectively translated into improvements in professional and agency performance, this failure will strengthen the demand for actual control of health agencies by the communities they serve and which depend on them. The scenario already being played in public education suggests that this is no fantasy.

What is unique in the developments whose possibility is outlined here is the role which is projected for workers, both "new careerists" and those more conventionally described as lower level workers in hospitals and other health institutions. The participation of workers as agents of change in the work which is done, its design, delivery and control, is a new idea in the history of the American worker. Except for the examples cited earlier, it remains an untested hypothesis which rests more on an analysis of the critical failures of health services, and their connection with manpower needs and uses, than on historical evidence. Equally speculative is the implied connection of the organized new careerists and health workers with the urban-based forces seeking social change which reached new levels of activity and effectiveness in the 1960's, but the dramatic role played by ghetto-based organizations in the organizing campaigns of Local 1199 in several American cities suggest that this connection is more than a theoretical one. New careers advocates have long argued that their proposals are important elements in the struggle for social change and progress, in the reconstruction of professionalism and the creation of a humane and responsive systems of human service which combine good principles of care with meaningful opportunities for employment and career development. We can look forward to an interesting future, which will tell us how accurate these predictions have been. There is considerable reason not to be overly skeptical.

GERALD G. SOMERS: Thank you very much Sumner. Our final topic, "Lessons from Technical Assistance," illustrates the continuity of today's sessions. Several speakers mentioned the concept this morning and now Arnold Nemore will devote his talk to this area. Arnold is past Executive Director of the Task Force and as such is familiar to most of us.

LESSONS FROM TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

by

Arnold Nemore

Thousands of man-hours of technical assistance have been provided to New Careers programs and in support of career development activities, but we have generally failed to accept much of what these experiences could have taught us. I am convinced that if we truly want to learn about the operation of programs in the field, being involved in technical assistance is a considerably better way to do this than getting involved in the actual operation of projects. In this short presentation, I will examine the history and reason for the existence of technical assistance and explore some recent experiences in technical assistance before suggesting some overall conclusions.

The origins of technical assistance in the New Careers program provides an interesting case study. The Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966 contained provisions for a New Careers program which shortly thereafter was delegated from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to the Department of Labor (DOL). During these negotiations, OEO expressed concern about the Department of Labor's bias toward numbers rather than quality in its manpower programs. Therefore, the OEO staff developed a contract for technical assistance with two organizations which had been committed to the New Careers philosophy prior to the passage of legislation. It was felt that these organizations might help keep the Department of Labor "honest." When the delegation was completed, the contract for technical assistance was also transferred to DOL.

In spite of the fact that DOL continues to fund technical assistance for New Careers programs (one of the original organizations is still used, the other has been replaced), no mechanism has ever been developed for evaluating or for making changes based upon the experiences of technical assistance. The arrangement for technical assistance between a local project and the technical assistance firm still resembles a maze. Request must go from the local project to local and regional DOL manpower people before it reaches the provider. Scheduling must often be cleared through all of these people. One is reminded of the husband and wife, who after an argument, speak only through their children.

Since the Department of Labor has continued technical assistance to New Careers projects, it is not unreasonable to ask, "Why?" One finds a number of reasons. First, the agency has recognized that the local project people who have responsibility for carrying out the program are not able to implement them in line with national guidelines. If the Budget Bureau and the Civil Service Commission had permitted them to hire the staff, the Department probably would have chosen to make greater use of in-house technical assistants. However, since that has not been a real option, federal agencies have turned to outside consulting organizations.

A number of what might best be called political reasons cloud the picture in the case of technical assistance for both New Careers and career development. Although New Careers programs have not achieved most of their goals, the New Careers and career development philosophy has been incorporated, at least verbally, not only into most anti-poverty and manpower programs but into most "human service" legislation. Since follow-up on the Congressional mandate for career development has been exceedingly difficult, the hiring of consulting firms committed to New Careers and career development can be used by the federal agency as an indication of sincerity to interested outsiders. This has been an important factor in explaining contracts for technical assistance.

If one shifts from the federal agency to the recipient point of view, there are also a number of reasons why a local agency or project may request or accept technical assistance. The first and most frequent is that they have serious problems which they want help in solving. In other cases, the federal agencies offer technical assistance and projects accept, fearing that rejection of such assistance will indicate a lack of willingness to improve and, therefore, jeopardize future funding. Still another reason for requesting technical assistance is that it is recommended by someone in the granting agency or at a meeting as a good idea. Hoping to make points or get something for nothing, the agency will then request such assistance.

From the viewpoint of the consulting firm, technical assistance car be a rewarding and well-paying job. In the New Careers and career development arena, it has been undertaken by firms which have had a greater interest in changing human service agencies than have the federal agencies. The firm with which I work has been actively involved in technical assistance in New Careers and career development for both the Department of Labor and OEO. Our contracts very considerably. My contract calls for providing technical assistance to four OEO-funded neighborhood health centers. To provide this assistance, we have three full-time professional staff members. This means that we can provide almost one man-year of technical assistance per project per year. Another project also designed to provide similar technical assistance only has one additional full-time professional member but it must service almost thirty projects. Still another project with six or seven full-time professional staff seeks to provide technical assistance to more than one hundred projects.

Since I find it somewhat difficult to generalize about technical assistance, let me take a few moments to provide some specifics from my own recent experiences. Our contract calls for technical assistance in career development, training, and manpower utilization to four health centers. Although we had a fairly detailed knowledge of OEO neighborhood health centers, it took approximately three months to gain an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of each project and its staff. During this period, we spent more time with each of our projects than any of my firm's other contracts are able to provide in an entire year. As we began to develop relationships with project staff, we quickly discovered that career development, training, and manpower utilization ranked very low on their list of priorities. All of the projects had serious organizational, administrative, management, decision-making, and communications problems which were considere far more critical than their career development needs. Our attempts to involve the staff in discussions on career development, for the most part, fell upon deaf ears. Therefore, we approached our federal project managers and indicated that the projects with which we were working were currently not prepared to undertake career development, and even more importantly, not truly interested in such activities. However, we found a fair amount of potential in these projects and suggested an alternative strategy. Since we could provide a number of services which they both wanted and needed, we proposed doing this to gain their acceptance and respect. With the approval of our federal managers we began to focus on administrative and organizational problems. At the same time we undertook the time-consuming occupational analysis work which is the foundation for our work in career development and manpower utilization. During the five months this strategy was pursued, we gained the confidence of top management in two of the three projects with which we were working. In the third project, we were unable to develop the kind of effective communications essential to any helping relationship. We then requested to be relieved of responsibility for that project and to replace it with another.

As the other projects where we had begun to gain the respect and attention of staff, we began to indicate what career development would demand of them. Since they found it difficult to believe how great the demands of a real career development program were, we broke the planning for career development into small manageable pieces and began working on these. Since communications and supervisory training was badly needed everywhere, we worked with the project in developing this training. This is where we are currently.

Mu recent experiences have made one thing very clear unless a project's problems are clear-cut and relatively simple, effective technical assistance requires that the provider align his incentive system with the expectations of the project staff. This has required from one to two man-months in our case. Such a posture forces a technical assistance group to make realistic recommendations rather than theoretically appealing ones which are difficult to implement and whose results they will never see. Since we spend a fair amount of time with our projects, we have had to live with the implementation and results of our recommendations. This has been helpful for us and I think also for the projects. People who provide only one or two man-months per year per project cannot develop this kind of relationship nor can they really attune themselves to the project, its goals, and its style.

Another major conclusion from my experiences is that career development can not be effectively dealt with except in the context of a project's goals and administration. While I can easily generalize about problems in the projects, I am not readily able to generalize about their solution. We have tended to tailor our recommendations so that they draw upon staff strengths. Therefore, they are very much linked to the specific project.

I have taken this time to detail some of our activities because I think it is helpful to explain why I think technical assistance has generally failed to provide the kind of assistance really needed in the New Careers and career development areas. We have been fortunate in that our agenda and that of the federal agency have been identical. We have also had the time to bring our agenda and that of the project into line. In most other technical assistance endeavors, time and monetary limitations are such that closure is rarely possible. Therefore, it is relatively easy to understand why often none of the parties is satisfied.

I am still struggling to understand what the lessons really are and what they mean. Just the other day, some of the paradoxes were brought home to me as I returned from the field. I had a telephone call from someone I know who wanted assistance in putting together a project. His project would be a mental health facility for children for one region of his state. He was interested in help in two areas: (1) a project of the need for mental health manpower in the state and (2) a hard look at changing the patterns of utilization in delivering mental health services for children. First, I inquired as to how much change was wanted. He indicated the need for considerable change since much of what was being done was ineffective. After discussing that for a few minutes, we began to agree on a rationale for working out that phase of the project. He next turned to the projection of demand over the next ten years. When asked whether he wanted demand given the current position of utilization or a new one, he indicated that it was necessary to use the current pattern since the new pattern could not be known.

When asked why bother with projections, he replied that the people who provided the money want to know how many people were going to be needed and what were their characteristics. When challenged as to why bother with the utilization part if he believed the second part had no validity, he said, We don't have to believe in it if the people who give us money believe in it." This kind of attitude and "gaming strategy" while recognized is often not adequately considered by those in Washington who develop and implement projects.

The paradoxes are also apparent as we listen to Sumner Rosen and Eleanor Gilpatrick talk about their work in New York City. They talk glowingly about their work with New York City hospitals and about the strides being made. Yet only a month ago I met with a group of consumers who were talking about hospital health services in New York City. Rather than progress these people were concerned about the tremendous downgrading of health services in these same New York hospitals. What is the relationship between these events? How have we in Washington who have the responsibility for advising on these issues considered the relationships between patterns of manpower utilization, delivery of service, and the quality of service? How do they fit together? Neighborhood health centers staffs repeatedly ask us what Washington really wants. What should be our major emphasis, providing quality services, training community people, implementing community involvement, demonstrating new ways of doing things, or running low-cost-per-patient operations. Those who have been working on these problems for three years haven't yet come up with answers. They face complex problems for which they get little help and the situation is further complicated by constantly changing signals from Washington.

These are important issues that those who provide technical assistance must confront if we are to do more than "con" people. They are, unfortunately, the kind of questions which tend to be avoided and not to get asked. Answering them forces us to admit we are part of the "game" and forces us to come to terms with the implications of this.

Another great part of the game is the demonstration project. I repeatedly receive glowing reports of what has been or can be done and its easy replication in other circumstances or situations. When I checked the author, however, I find he has six university degrees and/or affiliations next to his name. A couple of days later I went to Beckley, West Virginia--250 miles from Washington, 5 hours by car and 6 hours by airplane--and I was returned to the "real world." Can the successes of the projects in Berkeley, California really be duplicated in Beckley? When I visit New York City or Boston--where all great things are--I find that they don't even duplicate their own demonstrations. In the East End of Boston, within 15 minutes of some of the best medical schools in the country, you can find mortality, morbidity, and health statistics which are comparable with those on an Indian reservation hundreds of miles from a medical center. What kind of game is it that we are playing? What is it that we are really trying to do? What is the role and thrust of New Careers? Career development?

Here I know my good friend, Sar Levitan, would ask, "Why then does a consulting firm undertake such an assignment? One answer is, "It pays." Another is that consultant firms join with the federal agencies in deceiving themselves and each other. Unfortunately, I believe that deception has been so complete that we have failed to learn much either from our successes or our failures. In spite of these problems, projects have profited from the advice offered by technical assistance organizations. Even where other things are lacking, the technical assistance firm usually bring objectivity, knowledge, and some experience into project operations. Whether or not it is worth the cost, I have not yet been able to determine. However, I think we have begun to recognize that the amount of time needed for good technical assistance is considerably more than most agencies are willing to pay for directly and that technical assistance does not insure success.

Addendum

I have discovered that the following problems are familiar to most New Careers projects.

(1) Difficulty in developing jobs with decent wages. Even though during the first year the wages of New Careerists are paid entirely from federal funds, these positions must be slotted into an existing wage structure. If, as has been the case in many places, the wage structure is low, then bringing in of New Careers employees at a higher wage can play havoc with the entire wage structure and can create conflict between New Careerists and other employees.

(2) Difficulty in providing meaningful jobs. Since many of the organizations were attracted to New Careers by the prospect of free labor and formerly had not employed people in subprofessional roles, the process of developing jobs was often a hit or miss affair. The nature of the job usually remained with the supervisor. If he were conscientious, he would examine the potential of his New Careerist (s) and the jobs which were being done and try to develop a new job which challenged the New Careerist to begin using his potential. If he were less than sympathetic or felt challenged by the New Careerist, he could have his new employee perform most of the menial functions associated with the institution e.g., helping remove clothes in school).

Developing meaningful jobs also means establishing rapport and creating a complementary relationship between the professional and the new subprofessional. This can be extremely difficult in activities where the professionals have had difficulty in attaining professional status (e.g., police, social workers). Racial overtones (e.g., white housing inspector and black inspection aide), sexual distinctions (e.g., female teacher and male teacher aide), language barriers, and other interpersonal problems can all thwart attainment of rapport and development of a complementary relationship. Professional organization support has been mixed, sometimes obstructionistic, sometimes helpful.

(3) Difficulty in assuring a permanent position. While most human services organizations can easily absorb staff, making a new position permanent often requires some change in a civil service requirement and always requires additional money. Usually the final decision on the amount of money available is not determined by the administrator but by a higher authority. Even when the total funds are alloted, the administrator must choose between more professionals, more subprofessionals, more equipment, more supplies, etc. While New Careers proponents have little difficulty making the decision, the administrator is buffeted by conflicting interests if he tries to create permanent new positions.

Changing civil service requirements often demands the patience of Job. First, positions must be described and justified. Then provision must be made to accept successful job performance in lieu of or as a substitute for formal education (i.e., high school diploma) or test scores (i.e., passing civil service examinations). Here again the relationship between the professional and subprofessional plays a major role. If the professionals feel challenged, they can use the civil service merit system as a mechanism for "keeping out newcomers."

(4) Difficulty in providing formal education and on-the-job training relevant to the New Careerist and his advancement. Too little work has been done in most human service organizations in developing relevant OJT for new employees. Most are expected to pick up the job by doing it. Since New Careerists are not as well prepared as former employees and many have, through experience, developed "failure syndromes," OJT is of special significance. Without it, the New Careerist will often react negatively to his work, accepting only menial responsibilities assuring frustration and a continuing feeling of failure.

In developing formal education programs, New Careers projects have found the universities generally unsympathetic, unwilling and unable to assist them. More positive reactions have come from community and junior colleges which see this as an area of rising demand. But even here, some education administrators fear they will be looked down upon or will be hurt by accreditation agencies if they accept people without formal credentials.

(5) Difficulty in providing career ladders or job progression. Here again the civil service system is confronted. Even when an entry-level job has been approved, provision of a career ladder is not assured. Job descriptions and justifications and development of promotion standards and procedures require long days of seemingly endless meetings. Also involved is development of some sort of substitute credentials or certificates which facilitate lateral job mobility or geographical mobility. Problems with developing good academic linkages have thus far made it difficult in most areas to bridge the gap between subprofessional and professional status even for the most capable and energetic.

The problem of career ladders and advancement, like the problem of wages, affects regular employees as well as New Careerists. Provision for special long-term arrangements for New Careerists which are not open to regular low-level employees with similar qualifications will certainly be unacceptable. With all these barriers to overcome, it is not surprising to learn that few projects have achieved the hoped-for success.

GERALD G. SOMERS: We will now have time for questions and comments. Please identify yourself.

JIM LUNDBERG: It seems to me that the rigidity of institutions and the lack of accommodation of the merit systems are major factors in implementing New Careers activities. In view of this wouldn't the New Careers kind of program be better if it provided technical assistance to governmental agencies to assist public agencies accommodate their institutions to New Careers. Actually these people are being given a horrendous task when they are asked to rebuild an organization which can accommodate New Careerists. We say they are incompetent but we've never given them any assistance to really accomplish that task. Don't you agree?

JEAN COUTURIER: I think that you have to do even more than that. One of the magic things about PSC is that it will provide the kind of assistance to broker the system and make the necessary changes--but what is even more critical is that it provides a needed mandate to these agencies. The New Careers program says you should create credentialed jobs within the system, but unfortunately all too frequently we get involved in the numbers game. I think safeguards ought to be built into the system to prevent this error and currently public service careers does not have enough of that protection built in. I don't think you can just create a job for $3,000 or $5,000; neither can you do it with outreach alone. Let me give you an illustration of an incident which occurred but it is not atypical. A black G.I., returning from Viet Nam, went to his local priest and said, "I need a job." The Priest said, "Well, I don't know--I kinda know the Mayor--I'll talk to him." So the Priest goes down and talks to the Mayor--and the Mayor said, "Oh Boy--sure, Father, we can take care of him--you send him down to the Civil Service Department. They have been screaming at me that the dogs are running around, people in the neighborhoods are complaining, they've been bitten by dogs and all that sort of thing, we're short of dog catchers. So there are slots--go down--they'll hire him." Three weeks later the Mayor sees the Priest again and he says "Well, how is that young man--did he get his job?" The Priest said, "No, he didn't get the job," and the mayor sayd, "Why not," and he says, "Well, one of the job requirements is that you have to have two years experience as a dog catcher before you can get a job as a dog catcher." Now my question is where do you get two years experience as a dog catcher" except being one? So what we did there was approach the canine corps in the city and ask them to let us use it as a training device. All of a sudden thirty-five jobs were created and this, incidentally, not at an investment of $7 million dollars or anything--just brokering the system.

In Los Angeles they finally realized after Watts that maybe if they just held an examination in the ghetto--the rigid, old-fashioned written examination--they might get some applicants in Watts. Up until that time apparently nobody had had the guts to walk into Watts to offer civil service tests. So they had 180 applicants for

104 jobs and something like 92 of them qualified and got hired. These are the little, nitty-gritty ways of changing the world. Now concerning your comment on technical assistance, that is what meaningful technical assistance is. Everybody thinks he knows the answers to all the problems but you have to go to people and say, "This has worked elsewhere; maybe it will work for you, too." Restructuring jobs is a very complicated and very different issue. I don't think anybody wants to pay for that, including the government.

SIDNEY FINE: It's a very slow process, but we should try to set short-term, intermediate and long-term goals to test our methods and against which we can measure our progress. Now our experience at Upjohn has been through a contract with the American Public Welfare Association which in turn contracts with the Department of Labor. We have been working largely with welfare agencies, concentrating specifically on restructuring of their jobs. In the past six months our systems approach to task analysis was introduced to about a dozen states. In a few of these states programs are under way that presumably will lead to intermediate goals whereby a lattice or ladder system may be created. Within the welfare agency itself a person will be able to start at the bottom and gradually move up or across through various fields and classifications using both in-house and on-campus training.

ELEANOR GILPATRICK: Is it true generally in civil service that you have promotional lines which are specified and imply no training requirement between steps? This to me is what makes the whole civil service system invidious to upgrading, because real promotion should require these training steps. My feeling is that if you have the commitment to training for upgrading you don't need promotional lines, you need an overall manpower policy. Is civil service compatible with that?

JEAN COUTURIER: I organized the New York City Hospital system in 1955 and we tried to break up the then existing caste system. We succeeded with the practical nurses but failed with the nurses aides. Most governments and, I suspect, most employers promote people not because they are competent for a new job, but because they did a past job by some standard which they define as good. I think you will find throughout the civil service a tendency to have a closed promotional system which prohibits lateral entry. Everybody assumes that everyone is incompetent and they can't start in the middle; everybody thinks they have to start at the bottom. This concept of saying that people can only be promoted because they mastered yesterday's job is idiocy. A person is promoted because he is capable of doing tomorrow's job. Most civil services do not do this, but neither do private employment systems as far as that is concerned. I don't think training is the answer either, because I don't think most people want to be trained. Most people want to move up the ladder without being patronized, without being trained. They think they are already competent. You have two problems--you must motivate the guy to want to be trained and motivate the institution to accept the radical kind of training required.

GERRY SOMERS: The thrust of your comment, though, is that a credentialed requirement based on yesterday's job standards is irrelevant for tomorrow's job.

JEAN COUTURIER: I think so. But, incidentally, I don't mean to be gloomy. I think private employers and public employers are beginning to learn this. But it will still be a long, hard sales job. No employment system is now compatible with what we are trying to do.

S. M. Miller: I think this afternoon session has brought us closer together. I would like to state what I think the issues are and see if we can focus ourselves on them more sharply. One issue is who are we concerned about. I think there is an implicit disagreement among us about whether we are essentially concerned with blocked-out people or blocked-in people. Blocked-out people include the black, discriminated against, so-called hard-core person. During the middle part of the 1960's there was an effort to break open the system so these blocked-out people could get in. The other is a concern for the blocked-in people who are already there but are not able to go up. This concern focuses on the blue-collar, unionized workers (largely white) who have not had an increase in real income in the last five years. These are different kinds of concerns about people who aren't doing well. I think it is worthwhile to decide where our emphases should be.

Those blocked in--your poor group essentially--are one kind of issue.

The second issue is about the design of what we are doing. Some of us are talking about a design which essentially is upgrading. One model is to rationalize the factory situation; let's find out what job requirements really are necessary, construct the most efficient way of organizing jobs, and make some kind of connection between training and the job ladder. A second model--let's go to the other extreme--is to affect the quality of the service of a service agency at the same time that its labor force is changed. When you change the way people progress in the establishment, you're changing the organization as well as the way people behave. Bob Schrank has been telling me about a variety of interesting things taking place in private enterprise which involve still other models which reach outside the factory and tie the school and the factory much more closely together in the first two models.

A third issue is strategies of change. I think this afternoon we are beginning to think a little about how to get the changes. Can change occur inside-the-house, that is, is the main task only to get good models for slotting jobs in a rational way or do you need a great deal of external pressure to achieve deep change. I have a feeling that we really haven't worked out a sense of how to connect the inside and outside strategy. We should outline the kinds of models that we think are significant and begin to talk about the situations under which a model is likely to have an effect and under what conditions it isn't likely to have an effect.

Fundamentally, I think we are disagreeing about the kinds of models to push and the reasons for pushing them. We have to realize that there are different kinds of goals for different kinds of issues.

ARNOLD NEMORE: One of the difficulties in implementing meaningful goals is that they frequently tend to overlap. Because a number of goals all seem good, we put them together thereby creating an impossible situation. It is difficult to change the existing structure in education, health, etc., and incidentally use the disadvantaged in the process. In many of the attempts to change the system mainly by using new people from the community, it has been easy for the people already in the system to focus their anxieties and pressures on these new people. The real problems which develop as a result of system change are then blamed on the new people. Since, in addition, the roles of these community people are often not clearly defined, they are considered failures because they don't function "properly."

This means that it is necessary not only to identify goals but to separate goals and set priorities which are realistic. Where and how do we want to begin changing the system? If this priority setting does not become realistic, we will continue to insist on trying to do everything at once and will probably fail.

SIDNEY FINE: I have drawn the distinction as far as my own work is concerned between the techniques that need to be used to do some of the things that we want to do, such as restructure jobs and the strategies that are necessary for getting the job done once you presumably know how to do some of the things that you need to do. I prefer to approach workers in the bureaucracy from the point of view that they want to do the job better than they are now doing it. They really have a strong thrust in this direction--they are looking for new methods and they are also looking for new strategies. I can't help them much on strategy because each situation differs so much from state to state. I prefer to leave strategy to those people so long as they know how to manage the situation with whatever techniques that I can make available. I also try to keep on hand a number of techniques that are not necessarily particular to my approach so that I can refer them to those as well. This means, in short, I don't have a model. Rather, I have an approach and I have a technique that can help them in a number of situations but I have to learn from them and be flexible enough to adapt this technique very often to their special situation.

JEAN COUTURIER: One of the realities that we live with is that we are in a world in which you fit the guy to the job and we're talking about a world in which you want to fit the job to the guy. When we attempt to do this we must face a great deal of resistance, hostility, and fear. We talk about New Careers where there very often are not careers. Just how many levels of nurses aides can you actually create and have a meaningful career. My question is whether you can go into a hospital and take a very simple hospital job and meaningfully break it down so that you can find people in West Virginia who have no background and come into it as opposed to taking those people and making them nurses aides but spend six months training them first.

ELEANOR GILPATRICK: We don't suit the job to the person nor do we make four grades of nurses aides. I do not believe you can design a job to fit a person except in a poetic sense, because you know that technology decides what needs to be done and how. The question is, "Can you derive the most from the investment in prior training and the already good performance of a worker and also give him an option to go someplace in another kind of activity which is higher in skill and payment but is related?" I say "ladder" because everyone does. But a "lattice" is what I'm really talking about. I think it's a crime to create the "senior nurse aide" as an upgrading step for the simple reason that the pay differential between it and a practical nurse isn't worth the time to train, and it carries no credits to be used in later training. But you can begin to develop families of job in patient-related care, so that one person can eventually do intensive care therapy, another person can do ward work involving giving reassurance and tender loving care, and a third person can go into administration. Our method is technologicall oriented, but we also give strategy advice on how to use the market to get what is wanted and we always stress the need for an employee counseling system. No existing organization understands me when I first start talking, but eventually they begin to. The changes that I have seen take place in the municipal hospital system are not staggering, but a number of these concepts are finally beginning to take hold.

SUMNER ROSEN: First, in response to Dr. Gilpatrick's comments, I accept responsibility for senior nurse aide jobs in the New York city hospitals. We defined it as an interim step, a symbolic gesture of what the union intended to do. I would challenge anybody to invalidate that decision, either in terms of its effects on the morale, motivation and attitudes of the people who got the jobs, or the quality of the training that was appropriate for the position.

It was not designed, nor was the nurses aides' up-grading program designed, as a comprehensive program. It was intended to fill a vacuum and to change the climate of opinion in order to set the stage for the really important discussion of how to change the entire system of manpower use.

The issue of union relationships with new careers is illustrated in two cases in New York City, involving demands made on unions which have bargaining power and clout by "New Careerists," or paraprofessionals. In one case the union simply didn't understand what the paraprofessionals wanted and failed to satisfy their needs. In the other case the union understood and accepted a demand which had to do with a new kind of non-credentialled access to an existing career ladder. The leadership internalized this demand in the union's procedures and was committed to use union power to get it. They succeeded, and set a precedent for further change in the welfare department.

The problem we are discussing is how to produce systems change; this means a knowledge of styles and modes of intervention. There is no single solution but one has to be sensitive to the vulnerability of systems, their ripeness for change and, above all in my judgment, the constituencies that are ready to stand together or be brought together in order to make change happen. There is no one model, but any model which excludes that dimension is going to fail.

ARNOLD NEMORE: How did the senior nurse aide position affect care in the hospital?

SUMNER ROSEN: We don't know, because nobody has the resources to examine it.

ARNOLD NEMORE: Was anybody interested in that?

SUMNER ROSEN: Of course we were interested, and we argued that it would improve care. We also argued that some of the aides were already doing jobs above the standard level for which they received no recognition and no status. The senior aide device was a way of giving recognition to de facto differentials which were not recognized, and telling the system to be more systematic about how it treats people. The basic problem was, and still is, that nurses aides were all called the same thing, and all got the same money, but did quite different things and performed at different levels of responsibility and skill. We are arguing for differentiating wage structures and for creating a structure of opportunity based on those differentials, and this was a symbolic way of making the point.

SAM MARKS: I'm a little concerned about whether we are taking a serious look at the year 2000 or just the 1970's. In 1940 Tristian Banford did a study on the long-wall method of coal mining in Great Britain. Let me briefly point it out to us as a group since we are talking about career design. In Great Britain they used to mine coal as a family unit. No one had any particular skill but together they had a group of skills. One day the engineers came in and started to redesign the system with a nice neat job hierarchy and a unilinar model for mining coal. Everyone was to use a specific technique each with his own separate skill. The coal mining industry almost collapsed in Great Britian because of the well-defined restructuring process that took place. Now we are starting to examine the elimination of specific skill structures altogether and letting people choose a cluster of occupations.

SIDNEY FINE: I think the reason that both Eleanor and myself have stressed task analysis, and not job analysis, is precisely because of the point that you made. We should be looking at tasks and we should not be looking at traditional conglomerations of tasks in particular job clusters. The minute we start laying out job titles, lattices, and ladders, we are suddenly rigidified and take those things as givens. They are not givens. Our potential for restructuring jobs rests on the ingenuity with which we can reorganize tasks into jobs to achieve the objectives of an organization with the technologies available. That is what we have to explore and that is what creates the possibility for the very kind of thing that you are talking about.

JEAN COUTURIER: I forgot to make a comment on Gilpatrick's statement about technology because I think it is oversimplified. I would argue that everybody in this room has really defined his own job and that in every industry there are enormous options or flexibility available. I am impressed, for example, by the work of the telephone company where, in the fact of what looked like rather rigid technological requirements, they have been able, in a rather creative and exciting way, I think, to redesign work and recombine tasks in more humanely satisfying ways.

GERRY SOMERS: Thanks for your participation today. It has been most stimulating. Our Chairman has suggested that we discontinue this period and move to the summary. Charles!

SUMMARY

SAR A. LEVITAN: Eli Cohen and I have been assigned the responsibility to present an overall summary of today's sessions. Our division of labor calls for Eli to offer the substantive review, since he is the intellectual, and I will do the usual ceremonial peroration. Finally, we'll call on Bishop Robson to deliver the benediction.

Of course, Mike Miller has already summarized these meetings, but while I've been sitting in the back two others have provided their own synposes of today's events. The first chairman of the Task Force, Fred Harbison, told me that, "Today the Task Force has succeeded in advancing the frontier of ignorance." Then Bob Schrank not to be outdone said, "We have succeeded in proving Parkinson's first law 'that work expands to fill the time allotted to it.' " We'll now let Eli elaborate on these two summaries.

SUMMARY BY ELI E. COHEN

What I hope to give you is more of a reaction than a summary. Perhaps I can recast what you've said, rather than repeat it, and maybe even play it back with some of my own biases. I'm indebted to Sar Levitan for the focus of this summary which is what have we learned today.

I'd say that the first thing we learned is that it's time we started to talk about upgrading. Here is truly a public policy lag in that policy lags behind need. For example, we finally discovered the working poor, but if we are to solve that problem we are going to have to increase the income of poor people. This includes not only those who are unemployed but also the employed who are earning insufficient money, and they outnumber the unemployed. Even private industry is awakening to the need for upgrading as a result of their personnel shortages and heavy turnover. This is being reflected in the beginning of a new direction towards upgrading by the JOBS program although the possibility of a recession may put a stop to this trend. Clearly we are late in talking about upgrading. This is something that we should have started to talk about in the 60's and not the 70's.

Secondly we haven't yet really learned how to talk about upgrading. At least not entirely. This is reflected in Mike Miller's comment that a dialogue is going on but he can't hear it. Part of our problem in talking about upgrading is the curious mix that we represent here. We are economists and academics, congressional staff and government bureaucrats, program operators, consultants and advocates and evangelists. And yet we recognized in the course of the discussion this morning that several important elements are missing--employers, unions and educators. Among ourselves we have really severe differences. We have differences in ideology, and we start at different points and at different levels of knowledge, but even more basically we have differences in values and priorities. Some of us ask questions like: What's this going to cost? What does it add to the product? How about the market? Others talk about the needs, the hopes, the aspirations of people. We need to narrow these differences to provide a more common base for a meaningful dialogue.

Thirdly, there has been a great deal of confusion, ignorance and conflict about the subject of upgrading. In part, this exists because of the reality which is that very, very little has been done about upgrading.

Fourthly, all of us are clearly and unanimously in favor of upgrading in the same way that we oppose stratification that limits mobility.

Fifthly, however, we disagree on how to achieve upgrading. We disagree in philosophy and in practice. Some of us are almost laissez faire in our approach in recommending that the responsibility be given to the employers. Give employers the necessary supports and funds--and even give them additional responsibilities, such as educating employees--and we'll be on the road to a solution. Others take a contrary view and feel that heavy government participation and funding is the answer. Still others take a smorgasbord approach; we really don't have a grand design and we need to test out various approaches. Then there are others who take an opportunistic approach (and I use the word "opportunistic" here in the best sense) who feel that we should seize and expand any opportunity for a breakthrough. Finally, there is the New Careers approach which we discussed at great length but which I can only summarize as an approach which is admittedly imperfect at present, operating under opposition and resistance, but possessing a great deal of potential in achieving upgrading. We seem to be greatly divided on the New Careers approach. Some hold it is unique, innovative, and creative--the most important development in manpower programming we've had in five or ten years. Those opposed feel that it is costly, and overpromises and question whether the New Careerists are capable of performing the required tasks with their limited education and credentials.

Let me,finally, try to pull together what you seem to be saying about what needs to be done to accelerate upgrading policies and practices. We have not talked enough about goals, but Mike Miller has helped immensely by calling our attention to the kinds of changes we want to effect and for whom. Do we want to change internally and make irrational structures more rational or do we want to change externally by re-designing the service and the way people are employed? Are we concerned with employed persons blocked from advancing upward or with the unemployed with no access to promotion?

We have not talked enough about strategy either. Our choices are to work through the system or to change the system. I suspect we need to do both, but, as one of you has said, we need to figure out how to connect the two strategies. Involved is the design of models to fit into a variety of situations, methods for dealing with resistance, and the commitment of greater resources for upgrading. Also needed is a more highly developed technology to narrow the gap between designing a model and carrying it out.

At least two sets of conditions are needed to develop effective upgrading. The first is a high level of employment. So long as unemployment is a major problem, the unemployed will get priority attention in our manpower programs. It is only when we reach a low level of unemployment approaching relatively full employment that we can get attention to upgrading. The federal government's recent efforts to combat inflation, by increasing unemployment, will make it much more difficult to face up to the problem of upgrading.

A second condition that we need to deal with is the issue of credentialism. A pre-requisite to effective upgrading is a fresh start on what a person has to know and what skills he has to develop to perform specific tasks rather than academic or other irrelevant requirements.

There seems to be no single answer here. A pluralistic approach in terms of goals, strategies and models related to a variety of options seems to be indicated at this juncture of our development.

Let me close by saying this conference's value has been primarily in telling us what we don't know and need to find out. Heeding Eleanor Gilpatrick's admonition that there are not deadend people but only deadend jobs will better fortify us to deal with the problems ahead.

Sar A. Levitan

To follow the insightful comments and incisive summaries of Mike Miller and Eli Cohen is an anticlimax. Nonetheless, since the program calls for my winding up this seance, I will try to carry out the best laid plans.

First, it might be useful to explain how this conference came about. With the increased emphasis upon upgrading, the Task Force decided last year to look into those Labor Department activities that bear directly upon the subject. With that in mind, we tried to get into one room what Eli already described so well--the practitioners, the consultants (known affectionately as con men), the professional advisors (technical assistance experts), and academic researchers. You might be interested to learn that this was not an easy task. We have discovered that there are as many undercurrents and schisms in upgrading or New Careers as there are in any other Messianic movement. As Eleanor Gilpatrick indicated, we couldn't even pick a title for the conference without ruffling some feathers. To make everybody happy, we tried to suggest impartiality by making this an Upgrading and New Careers Conference. But this failed to satisfy either the new careerists or the upgraders.

Upgrading or new careers is a growing and expanding industry, and we had difficulty in lining up representative views of those who are working in the vineyards. As I indicated, we limited our invitations to those who have undertaken to do some work with Labor Department funds. We were delighted that all the eleven people we initially invited to make formal presentations at this conference accepted our invitation, and we are grateful to them.

I believe that a reading of the papers presented today will show that we have an excellent cross-section of those who have already made contributions to upgrading efforts funded by the Labor Department. Again, this does not mean that our choices met unanimous approval. One of the cardinals of the New Careers church wrote an indignant letter protesting that the Conference failed to include a paper by someone who apparently discovered "New Careers." We wrote back most respectfully that upgrading was already described in Exodus (Chapter 18), and we therefore questioned whether anybody today could claim a patent on the discovery of upgrading. Others commented on the absence from the panel of a representative from private industry. Bob Schrank suggested names of excellent people from several major corporations. We had to remind him that AT&T and General Motors do not work for the Labor Department, though they make a considerable contribution to the U.S. Treasury.

Turning to the proceedings of the conference, I have already heard some complaints that the sessions lacked focus. Whatever merit there is to this criticism, I believe that this certainly is not due to any shortcomings of the thoughtful papers that were presented here, but is rather a reflection of the whole business of upgrading under Labor Department manpower programs. If you don't know where you are going, any road will lead you there. The underlying problem, I believe, is that we are dealing with a very poorly defined area and refuse to face the very real problems inherent in implementing the new careers concept. All the rhetoric of the new careerists and upgraders notwithstanding, our society will continue to need the hewers of wood and drawers of water. Upgrading one group of workers does not, in most cases, eliminate their previous jobs, but requires the employers to find others to do the work of those upgraded. Obviously, we want to prevent any particular group from being predestined to be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water.

The question, then, is how can government-financed programs be used to improve on present upgrading practices in private and public jobs without stepping too heavily on the toes of vested groups or interests and at reasonable unit costs which would not bring down heavy criticism of all manpower programs. My impression is that, considering the resources available, it is difficult to justify the use of public funds to offer manpower program trainees the opportunity to leap frog over those who are currently employed. Seymour Brandwein identified the limited scope of the upgrading programs when he referred to them as a smorgasbord. I suppose that he meant that we can pick a little bit here and a little there but that the Labor Department programs obviously cannot offer any full repast for all those who might seek its help in upgrading.

One way to upgrade workers is to give them more income. In this sense, the government can provide for upgrading by raising minimum wages (though at the danger of eliminating some jobs) and by providing income supplements to the working poor. Possibly the most effective upgrading program that the government can encourage was already suggested by Russ Nixon when he stated that a full employment economy is a sine qua non for an effective upgrading program. When demand is there, employers seek out workers and are genuinely interested in finding ways to upgrade them.

In the present economy, with a slackening demand for labor, emphasis is likely to turn to the immediate pressing needs of the unemployed, and upgrading will be even more than today an exercise in mere rhetoric. As Arnold Nemore said, the government funds spent on upgrading will be more helpful in providing a living for a lot of consultants than it will be in aiding clients of the federal manpower programs.

Again, on behalf of the Task Force I would like to thank all of you for participating in this conference, and our special thanks to Congressman Scheuer, Russ Nixon, Eli Cohen, and the eight panelists who contributed papers for this occasion.

Before I turn the meeting back to our chairman, Professor Myers, for his benediction, I see that Mike Miller wants to add a peroration to this session.

S.M. MILLER: Isn't that a cynical way of summarizing the conference, Sar? You're labeling one thing a reality and another thing "unreality." That is frequently an one-sided approach which avoids analysis by a pretended pragmatism--and endows an ideological position with an apparently unideological argument.

Certainly we must recognize the difficulties of which there are an enormous number, as you have indicated. But we should not ignore the difficulties that many people have in trying to break through the occupation and economic market structure that we have. If we insisted that these changes are easy to make, we would not be "realistic." But if we as citizens and professions failed to try to direct the ways in which we want to move the society and capitulate to a facile sense of "realism," we are victims of blind market forces and employer practices imbued with a pseudo-rationality and impenetrability.

Yes, we have to comprehend the enormous difficulties in trying to accomplish what is needed. More important is that we need the courage to fail. Cynically, we must learn to fail in new ways; better, we need to establish new goals if necessary--at least let us have the courage to accept the possibility of new ways of moving and at least try to accomplish them. We should not give up the hope of change in America; we cannot afford to intensify the strong feelings of frustration by not even trying to reshape "reality."

CONCLUSION

CHARLES A. MYERS: I don't believe that Sar is as cynical as he sounds. I also have to disagree with my good friend and colleague Fred Harbison that this Conference will advance the frontiers of ignorance. Maybe I was ignorant, but I come away from these discussions feeling, as I think Mike Miller is suggesting, that there is a tremendous challenge to increase the opportunity for people, particularly those who have been left out of the system, to realize their human potentialities at whatever levels they can attain. On the other hand, there is also the real problem of how to intervene effectively in organizations to make the necessary institutional changes. There is a vast literature of how change is introduced--the concept of the change agent, etc. But I am always impressed when I talk with my friends in the behavioral sciences with the fact that it is not simply the recognition of the importance of change by the leadership of an organization, both public and private, but the kind of pressures under which he operates. If that pressure comes, as it did to the hospitals in New York City by the intervention of a union or from the impact of full employment, it still can generate organizational change. Now the role of the consultant is to utilize those pressures and work within the organization to get change so that human potentialities can be realized. If that sounds optimistic--so be it.

APPENDIX

Conference Participants

Curtis Aller
San Francisco State College

George Autry
North Carolina Manpower
Development Corporation

E. Wight Bakke
Yale University

Wm. R. Bechtel
Senate Subcommittee on
Employment, Manpower & Poverty

Seymour Brandwein
Department of Labor

Robert J. Brown
Department of Labor

Eli Cohen
National Committee on
Employment of Youth

Mrs. Mary Cole
Office of Economic Opportunity

Joseph W. Collins
Department of Labor

Jean Couturier
National Civil Service League

Jesse L. Davis
Department of Labor

Dennis A. Derryck
Metropolitan Applied Research
Center

Rashi Fein
Center for Community Health &
Medical Care

Sidney D. Fine
The W. E. Upjohn Institute for
Employment Research

J. R. Fishman
University Research Corporation

Sam Ganz
Economic & Manpower Corporation

Alan Gartner
New Careers Development Center

Eleanor Gilpatrick
Research Foundation of the City
University of New York

Eli Ginzberg
Columbia University

Lowell M. Glenn
National Manpower Policy Task
Force

Leonard Granick
New Careers Systems, Inc.

Frederick H. Harbison
Princeton University

Rada Harrison
Department of Labor

Myron Joseph
Carnegie-Mellon University

Paula Karatalos
Department of Labor

Bill Kolberg
Department of Labor

Sar A. Levitan
Center for Manpower Policy
Studies

James W. Lundberg
Social Development Corporation

Garth L. Mangum
The University of Utah

Samuel B. Marks
Skill Achievement Institute

F. Ray Marshall
University of Texas

David Marwick
Center for Manpower Policy
Studies

S. M. Miller
New York University

Charles A. Myers
M.I.T.

Arnold Nemore
University Research Corporation

Russell Nixon
Columbia University

Gail C. Osborne
Department of Labor

R. Thayne Robson
University of Utah

Howard Rosen
Department of Labor

Sumner Rosen
Institute of Public
Administration

Jane Sartori
Department of Labor

Honorable James H. Scheuer (D)
New York

Robert Schrank
Consultant, Ford Foundation

Peter Seitchik
Institute of Public Administration

Ralph Showalter
Social Development Corporation

Gerald G. Somers
University of Wisconsin

M. H. Trytten
National Academy of Sciences

Lloyd Ulman
University of California,Berkeley

Robert J. White
Department of Labor

Basil Whiting
Ford Foundation

Bernard Yabroff
Office of Education